arXiv:1405.3324v2 [math.RT] 28 May 2014

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ALTERNATING GROUP WHICH ARE IRREDUCIBLE OVER SUBGROUPS. II

ALEXANDER KLESHCHEV, PETER SIN, AND PHAM HUU TIEP

ABSTRACT. We prove that non-trivial representations of the alternating group A_n are reducible over a primitive proper subgroup which is isomorphic to some alternating group A_m. A similar result is established for finite simple classical groups embedded in A_n via their standard rank 3 permutation representations.

1. Introduction

If Γ is a transitive permutation group with a point stabilizer X then Γ is primitive if and only if $X < \Gamma$ is a maximal subgroup. So studying primitive permutation groups is equivalent to studying maximal subgroups. In most problems involving a finite primitive group Γ, the Aschbacher-O'Nan-Scott theorem [AS] allows one to concentrate on the case where Γ is almost quasi-simple, i.e. $L \lhd \Gamma/Z(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ for a non-abelian simple group L. The results of Liebeck-Praeger-Saxl [LPS] and Liebeck-Seitz [LS] then allow one to assume furthermore that Γ is a finite classical group.

In the latter case, the possible structure of maximal subgroups X is described by Aschbacher's theorem [A]: if $X < \Gamma$ is maximal then X belongs to

$$\mathcal{S} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{8} \mathcal{C}_i, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_8$ are collections of certain explicit natural subgroups of Γ, and $\mathcal{S}$ is the collection of almost quasi-simple groups that act absolutely irreducibly on the natural module for the classical group Γ.

It is not true, however, that every subgroup X in (1.1) is actually maximal in Γ. For $X \in \cup_{i=1}^{8} \mathcal{C}_i$, the maximality of X has been determined by Kleidman-Liebeck [KlL]. So let $X \in \mathcal{S}$. If X is *not* maximal then $X < G < \Gamma$ for a certain maximal subgroup G in Γ. The most challenging case to handle is when $G \in \mathcal{S}$ as well. This motivates the following problem, where $\mathbb{F}$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p \geq 0$:

Problem 1.1. *Classify all triples (G, V, X) where G is an almost quasi-simple finite group, V is an $\mathbb{F}G$-module of dimension greater than one, and X is a proper subgroup of G such that the restriction $\mathrm{Res}^G_X V$ is irreducible.*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 20C20, 20C30, 20B35, 20B15.

The first author was supported by the NSF (grant DMS-1161094) and the Humboldt Foundation. The second author was partially supported by the Simons Foundation (grant #204181). The third author was supported by the NSF (grants DMS-0901241 and DMS-1201374).

Many results have been obtained concerning various cases of Problem 1.1 — see for instance [KT2] and references therein. In this paper, we are mostly interested in the case G is is the alternating group $G = \mathsf{A}_n$ or the symmetric group S_n. In this case, under the assumption $p > 3$ (or $p = 0$), Problem 1.1 has been solved in [BK, KS2] — see also [KT1] for double-covers $\hat{\mathsf{A}}_n$ and $\hat{\mathsf{S}}_n$ and [S, KlW] for the characteristic zero case. A number of techniques employed in these papers unfortunately break down in the case $(G, X) = (\mathsf{A}_n, \mathsf{A}_m)$ and $p = 2, 3$ (and especially when X is a primitive subgroup of G). On the other hand, this case is of crucial importance in a number of applications. The purpose of this paper is to resolve this important case, and our main result is:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a primitive subgroup of A_n with $n > m \geq 9$. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an algebraically closed field of arbitrary characteristic and V be a non-trivial $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module. Then V is reducible over X.*

The bound $m \geq 9$ is the best possible — see Remark 8.2 and Lemma 8.1.

We emphasize that our methods also apply to many other primitive subgroups of A_n. To illustrate this, in this paper we handle the simple classical groups X that embed in A_n via their standard rank 3 permutation representations:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $X = L/Z(L)$ be a finite simple classical group, where L is one of the following group: $SL_d(q)$, $SU_d(q)$, or $Sp_d(q)'$ with $d \geq 4$, and $\Omega_d^{\pm}(q)$ with $d \geq 5$. Let W denote the natural d-dimensional module for L, and let X be embedded in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) = \mathsf{S}_n$ via its rank 3 permutation action on the set Ω of 2-dimensional subspaces of W in the case $L = SL_d(q)$, and of 1-dimensional singular subspaces of W otherwise. If V is any $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension > 1, then $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is reducible.*

We plan to extend this result to the remaining simple primitive subgroups of A_n in a sequel. Together with the results of [BK, KS2] and the current paper, this will completely solve Problem 1.1 for $G = \mathsf{A}_n$ in the cases that are of most interest for the Aschbacher-Scott program.

The paper is organized as follows. Basic notions are recalled in §2. Theorem 3.2 in §3 compares the dimensions of the Hom-spaces of irreducible S_n-modules in characteristic 2 over certain Young subgroups of S_n when n is even. Then Propositions 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 in §4 show in particular that the p-modular irreducible representations of A_n which do not extend to S_n must have large enough dimension (at least exponential in n). These results, which we believe are also of independent interest, allow us to discard non-S_n-extendible A_n-modules in the proof of Theorem 1.2. In §5 we describe the submodule structure of the permutation modules of S_n acting on subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of cardinality 2 or 3 in characteristic 2, again in the case of even n. This description plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 6.5 in §6, which gives a criterion for a 2-modular irreducible S_n-representation to be reducible over certain subgroups of S_n. Theorem 6.5 is then used in §7 to show that non-trivial 2-modular irreducible A_n-representations are reducible over A_m, if A_m is embedded into A_n via its actions on subsets or set partitions of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ — see Theorem 7.12. Theorem 1.2 is proved in §8, which also contains further results concerning non-primitive embeddings of A_m into A_n. The final §9 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, unless otherwise stated, we assume that the ground field $\mathbb{F}$ is algebraically closed, and $p := \mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F})$. For a group G, the trivial $\mathbb{F}G$-module is denoted $\mathbf{1}_G$ or simply $\mathbf{1}$ if it is clear what G is. If V is an $\mathbb{F}G$-module, we denote by $\mathrm{soc}(V)$ the socle of V, and for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, define $\mathrm{soc}^n(V)$ from $\mathrm{soc}^1(V) = \mathrm{soc}(V)$ and $\mathrm{soc}^n(V)/\mathrm{soc}^{n-1}(V) = \mathrm{soc}(V/\mathrm{soc}^{n-1}(V))$ for $n > 1$. We refer to the quotients $\mathrm{soc}^n(V)/\mathrm{soc}^{n-1}(V)$ as the *socle layers* of V and usually list them from bottom to top, i.e. first $\mathrm{soc}(V)$, then $\mathrm{soc}^2(V)/\mathrm{soc}(V)$, etc.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let

$$\Omega := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}.$$

For $r = 1, \ldots, n$, denote by Ω_r the set of r-element subsets of Ω. The symmetric group S_n acts naturally on the sets $\Omega = \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots, \Omega_n$ and the stabilizer of an element of Ω_r is conjugate to the subgroup $\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r} := \mathsf{S}_{\{1,2,\ldots,n-r\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{n-r+1,\ldots,n\}}$. We write $\mathsf{S}_{n-1,1}$ simply as S_{n-1}.

We denote by

$$M_r = \mathbb{F}\Omega_r \cong \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}}^{\mathsf{S}_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} \qquad (1 \le r \le n)$$

the permutation module for the action of S_n on Ω_r.

We recall some basic notions of representation theory of symmetric groups referring to [J2] for details. The irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-modules are labeled by p-regular partitions of n (if $p = 0$ then p-regular partitions are interpreted as all partitions). If λ is a p-regular partition of n, the corresponding irreducible module is denoted D^λ. The Specht modules over $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$ are labeled by partitions of n. If λ is such a partition, the corresponding Specht module is denoted S^λ.

Let $p = 2$. Consider the partition

$$\alpha_n = \begin{cases} (k+1, k-1) & \text{if } n = 2k \text{ is even,} \\ (k+1, k) & \text{if } n = 2k+1 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The irreducible module D^{α_n} is called *the basic spin module* for S_n. It is known [W, Table III] that

$$\dim D^{\alpha_n} = 2^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor}.$$

Let sgn_n be the sign module over $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$. For any p-regular partition λ, we have that $D^\lambda \otimes \mathrm{sgn}_n$ is an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module, so we can write $D^\lambda \otimes \mathrm{sgn}_n \cong D^{\lambda^{\mathbf{M}}}$, where

$$\mathbf{M} : \lambda \mapsto \lambda^{\mathbf{M}}$$

is the *Mullineux involution* on the set of p-regular partitions of n. To describe the Mullineux involution, we briefly recall the notion of the *Mullineux symbol* $G(\lambda)$ of λ, referring the reader to [FK] for details. Let h_1 be the number of nodes in the p-rim of λ, and let r_1 be the number of rows in λ. Delete the p-rim and repeat to obtain sequences $h_1, h_2, \ldots$ and $r_1, r_2, \ldots$. Let k be such that $h_{k+1} = r_{k+1} = 0$ but $h_k \neq 0 \neq r_k$. Then

$$G(\lambda) := \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \ldots & h_k \\ r_1 & r_2 & \ldots & r_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

It was proved in [Mu] that λ is uniquely determined by $G(\lambda)$. Moreover, we have

$$G(\lambda^{\mathbf{M}}) = \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \dots & h_k \\ h_1 - r_1 + \epsilon_1 & h_2 - r_2 + \epsilon_2 & \dots & h_k - r_k + \epsilon_k \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\epsilon_i := 0$ if $p|h_i$ and $\epsilon_i := 1$ otherwise. This description of $\mathbf{M}$ is the main result of [FK] (see also [BeO]), which was conjectured by Mullineux.

Given an irreducible representation D^λ, either the restriction $E^\lambda := \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n} D^\lambda$ is irreducible or $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n} D^\lambda \cong E^\lambda_+ \oplus E^\lambda_-$, a direct sum of two inequivalent irreducible representations. Moreover, every irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module is isomorphic to one of $E^\lambda_{(\pm)}$, and the only non-trivial isomorphism of the form $E^\lambda_{(\pm)} \cong E^\mu_{(\pm)}$ is $E^\lambda \cong E^{\lambda^{\mathbf{M}}}$.

If $p \neq 2$, then $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n} D^\lambda$ is reducible if and only if $\lambda = \lambda^{\mathbf{M}}$. If $p = 2$, then an explicit criterion for reducibility of $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n} D^\lambda$ is given in [Ben, Theorem 1.1].

3. Comparing some Hom-spaces

Throughout this section we assume that $p = 2$. In this section we get some results on the dimensions

$$d_r(V) := \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_r, \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)) = \dim \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} V). \tag{3.1}$$

The last equality follows using $M_r = \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}}$ and Frobenius reciprocity.

Lemma 3.1. *Let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module and $1 \leq r \leq n$. Then $d_r(V) = 1$ if and only if $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} V$ is irreducible.*

Proof. The sufficiency of the condition is clear. Conversely, irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-modules are self-dual, so the restriction $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} V$ is self-dual. Since irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}$-modules are also self-dual, the head of $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} V$ is isomorphic to its socle. So if $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-r,r}} V$ is reducible then $d_r(V) > 1$. □

The goal of this section is to prove the following result:

Theorem 3.2. *Let V be a simple $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module and $2|n \geq 6$. Then one of the following statements holds:*

(i) *$d_3(V) > d_1(V)$.*
(ii) *$V \cong D^{\alpha_n}$ is the basic spin module or $V \cong \mathbf{1}$ is the trivial module, in which cases we have $d_3(V) = d_1(V)$.*

Let $V = D^\lambda$ for a 2-regular partition

$$\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \ldots > \lambda_s > 0)$$

of n. If $s = 1$, then V is the trivial module, and Theorem 3.2 holds trivially.

Lemma 3.3. *Theorem 3.2 holds if $d_1(V) = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $d_1(V) = d_3(V) = 1$ and $\dim V > 1$. By Lemma 3.1, V is irreducible over S_{n-1} and $\mathsf{S}_{3,n-3}$, and so the lemma follows from [P, Theorem 10]. □

Lemma 3.4. *Theorem 3.2 holds if $s = 2$.*

Proof. Since n is even, we have that the restriction $D^\lambda|_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}$ is irreducible by [K1]. So $d_1(V) = 1$, and we may apply Lemma 3.3. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let*

$$x := \sum_{g \in \mathsf{S}_{\{1,2,3\}},\ \sigma \in \mathsf{S}_{\{1,4\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{2,5\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{3,6\}}} (\operatorname{sign} \sigma) \sigma g \sigma^{-1} \in \mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n.$$

If $s > 2$, then $xD^\lambda \neq 0$.

Proof. By [BaK, Lemma 4.7] with $(m, p) = (3, 2)$, we see that the restriction $V|_{\mathsf{S}_6}$ has a composition factor isomorphic to $D^{(3,2,1)}$, which for $p = 2$ is isomorphic to the Specht module $S^{(3,2,1)}$. Since $x \in \mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_6$, it suffices to prove that $xS^{(3,2,1)} \neq 0$. We use the notation of [J2, §4]; in particular, e_t is the polytabloid and $\{t\}$ is the tabloid corresponding to a $(3, 2, 1)$-tableau t. Let

$$t := \begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 2 & 5 \\ \cline{1-2} 3 \\ \cline{1-1} \end{array}, \quad s := \begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 5 \\ \cline{1-2} 6 \\ \cline{1-1} \end{array}.$$

An explicit calculation shows that $\{s\}$ appears in xe_t with coefficient 1. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 3.2. Recall that M_3 is the permutation module on all three element subsets $\{i, j, k\} \subseteq \Omega$, while M_1 is the permutation module on the one element subsets $\{i\} \subseteq \Omega$. Consider the $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module homomorphism

$$f : M_3 \to M_1,\ \{i, j, k\} \mapsto \{i\} + \{j\} + \{k\}.$$

It is easy to see that f is surjective. So it induces an injective linear map

$$f^* : \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_1, \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_3, \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)),\ \psi \mapsto \psi \circ f.$$

It suffices to prove that f^* is not surjective.

We exhibit an element $\phi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_3, \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{F}}(V))$ which is not in the image of f^*. For $\Theta \subseteq \Omega$ let $\mathsf{S}_\Theta \subseteq \mathsf{S}_n = \mathsf{S}_\Omega$ be the subgroup of all permutations which stabilize the elements of $\Omega \setminus \Theta$. Now, define ϕ as follows:

$$\phi(\{i, j, k\})(v) := \sum_{g \in \mathsf{S}_{\{i,j,k\}}} gv, \qquad (\{i, j, k\} \subseteq \Omega,\ v \in V). \tag{3.2}$$

If $\phi \in \operatorname{Im} f^*$, then $\phi = \psi \circ f$ for some $\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_1, \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{F}}(V))$. Consider the element

$$E = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathsf{S}_{\{1,4\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{2,5\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{3,6\}}} (\operatorname{sign} \sigma) \sigma\{1, 2, 3\} \in M_3.$$

Note that $f(E) = 0$. So $\phi(E) = \psi(f(E)) = 0$. On the other hand, we compute $\phi(E)$ using (3.2):

$$\phi(E)(v) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathsf{S}_{\{1,4\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{2,5\}} \times \mathsf{S}_{\{3,6\}}} (\operatorname{sign} \sigma) \sum_{g \in \mathsf{S}_{\{\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \sigma(3)\}}} gv = xv,$$

where x is as in Lemma 3.5. Now Lemma 3.5 yields a contradiction.

4. Dimension and extendibility to S_n

First we prove the following statement, which relies on some results of [Ben] and [GLT]:

Proposition 4.1. *Let $p = 2$, $n \geq 5$, and let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module. Suppose that V does not extend to S_n. Then $\dim V \geq 2^{(n-6)/4}$.*

Proof. By assumption, $W := \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathsf{A}_n}^{\mathsf{S}_n}(V)$ is an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module, and $\dim W = 2\dim V$. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \ldots \lambda_s > 0)$ be the partition of n into distinct parts corresponding to W. Since W is reducible over A_n, by [Ben, Theorem 1.1], we have $s > 1$ and $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \in \{1, 2\}$. In particular, $n \geq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 2\lambda_1 - 2$, i.e. $\lambda_1 \leq (n+2)/2$. Now

$$\dim W \geq 2^{\frac{n-\lambda_1}{2}} \geq 2^{\frac{n-(n+2)/2}{2}} = 2^{\frac{n-2}{4}},$$

thanks to [GLT, Theorem 5.1]. □

We will also need the following branching result which is of interest in its own right:

Proposition 4.2. *Let $p = 2$, and $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \ldots > \lambda_s > 0) \neq (n)$ be a non-trivial 2-regular partition of n. If $2\lambda_1 - n \geq k \geq 3$ then the restriction of D^λ to a natural subgroup S_k of S_n affords both $\mathbf{1} = D^{(k)}$ and $D^{(k-1,1)}$ as composition factors.*

Proof. We apply induction on $m := n - \lambda_1 \geq 1$. If $m = 1$, then $D^\lambda = D^{(n-1,1)}$ is the heart of the natural permutation module, and the statement follows easily. Let $m \geq 2$.

Case 1: $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ is odd. Then, in the terminology of [K2, Definition 0.3], 2 is a normal index. Let $j \geq 2$ be the largest normal index; in particular j is a good index in the sense of [K2, Definition 0.3] again. Then by [K2, Theorem 0.5], D^μ is a simple submodule of $D^\lambda|_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}$, where

$$\mu = \lambda(j) := (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{j-1}, \lambda_j - 1, \lambda_{j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_s) \vdash (n-1).$$

Note that $2\lambda_1 - (n-1) \geq k+1$ and $(n-1) - \lambda_1 = m - 1$. Hence we can apply the induction hypothesis to D^μ restricted to S_k.

Case 2: $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ is even. Now 1 is a normal index. Then by [K2, Theorem 0.4], D^ν is a composition factor of $D^\lambda|_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}$, where

$$\nu = \lambda(1) := (\lambda_1 - 1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_s) \vdash (n-1).$$

Since $(\lambda_1 - 1) - \lambda_2$ is odd, as in Case 1 we now see that 2 is a normal index for ν. Let $j \geq 2$ be the highest normal index of ν; in particular j is a good index. Then again by [K2, Theorem 0.5], D^μ is a simple submodule of $D^\lambda|_{\mathsf{S}_{n-2}}$, where

$$\mu = \nu(j) := (\lambda_1 - 1, \ldots, \lambda_{j-1}, \lambda_j - 1, \lambda_{j+1}, \ldots, \lambda_s) \vdash (n-2).$$

Note that $2(\lambda_1 - 1) - (n-2) \geq k$ and $(n-2) - (\lambda_1 - 1) = m - 1$. Hence we can apply the induction hypothesis to D^μ restricted to S_k. □

Using the Mullineux involution, we prove an analogue of Proposition 4.1 for $p \neq 2$ (certainly, the most interesting case being $p \leq n$):

Proposition 4.3. *Let $n \geq 5$ and $p \neq 2$.*

(i) *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$ be a p-regular partition of n. Suppose that $\lambda_1 \geq (n+p+2)/2$. Then D^λ is irreducible over A_n.*

(ii) *Let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module. Suppose that V does not extend to S_n. Then* $\dim V \geq 2^{(n-p-5)/4}$.

Proof. (i) Recalling the definition of the Mullineux map from Section 2, denote the partitions obtained from λ by successively removing p-rims as $\lambda^{(j)}$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. We prove the statement by induction on $n-\lambda_1$. Since $\lambda_1 \geq (n-\lambda_1)+p+2$ by the assumption, the first p-segment of the p-rim of λ has length p. Assume for a contradiction that $\lambda = \lambda^{\mathbf{M}}$. Then

$$h_i + \epsilon_i = 2r_i \tag{4.1}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Suppose first that the p-rim of $\lambda' := (\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \ldots)$ has at most $p-1$ nodes. Write $h_1 = p + x$ and $r_1 = 1 + y$, where $0 \leq x \leq p-1$ and y is the number of rows of λ'. Then according to (4.1) we have

$$p + x \leq p + x + \epsilon_1 = h_1 + \epsilon_1 = 2r_1 = 2 + 2y. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that x is the length of the p-rim of λ'. Hence $y \leq x$, and so (4.2) yields $x \geq p-2 > 0$. In turn, this implies that $p \not| h_1$, whence $\epsilon_1 = 1$ and (4.2) yields $x = y = p-1$ (as $x \leq p-1$). Recall we are assuming that the p-rim of λ' has at most $p-1$ nodes. It follows that the p-rim of λ' has exactly $p-1$ nodes and λ' also has $p-1$ rows. This can happen only when $\lambda' = (1^{p-1})$, a column of $p-1$ nodes. In this case, $\lambda^{(1)} = (\lambda_1 - p)$ has one part, which is of length ≥ 2. Hence the p-rim of $\lambda^{(1)}$ is of length p (if $\lambda_1 \geq 2p$), or $z \geq 2$ (where $2p-1 \geq \lambda_1 = p + z \geq p+2$). Correspondingly, $r_2 = 1$ and $(h_2, \epsilon_2) = (p, 0)$ or $(z, 1)$. In either case

$$h_2 + \epsilon_2 \geq z + 1 \geq 3 > 2r_2,$$

contrary to (4.1).

Assume now that the p-rim of λ' has at least p nodes. Then, aside from the first p-segment contained in the first row, the p-rim of λ contains at least p nodes of λ'. It follows that the condition $\lambda_1 \geq (n-\lambda_1) + p + 2$ also holds for $\lambda^{(1)}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\lambda^{(1)}$ is not equal to its Mullineux dual, i.e. $h_i - r_i + \epsilon_i \neq r_i$ for some $i \geq 2$, again contradicting (4.1).

(ii) By assumption, $W := \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathsf{A}_n}^{\mathsf{S}_n}(V)$ is an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module and $\dim W = 2 \dim V$. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$ be the p-regular partition of n corresponding to W. Since W is reducible over A_n, $\lambda_1 \leq (n+p+1)/2$ by (i). It now follows by [GLT, Theorem 5.1] that

$$\dim W \geq 2^{\frac{n-\lambda_1}{2}} \geq 2^{\frac{n-(n+p+1)/2}{2}} = 2^{\frac{n-p-1}{4}},$$

which implies the result. □

Here is another version of Proposition 4.3:

Proposition 4.4. *Let $p > 2$, $n \geq 5$, and $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$ be a p-regular partition of n. Suppose that there is some $s \geq 1$ such that*

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_s - \lambda_{s+1} \geq p$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \lfloor \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}}{p} \rfloor > \frac{n}{2p-1}.$$

Then D^λ is irreducible over A_n. In particular, if

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 + p \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{2p-1} \right\rceil,$$

then D^λ is irreducible over A_n.

Proof. Assume that D^λ is reducible over A_n. Then $\lambda = \lambda^{\mathbf{M}}$ and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} (h_i - 2r_i + \epsilon_i) = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

We will estimate $h_1 - 2r_1 + \epsilon_1$ by going down the p-segments of the p-rim of λ. Since $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \geq p$, the first p-segment consists of p nodes of the first row and so contributes $p-2$ to $h_1 - 2r_1 + \epsilon_1$. More generally, any horizontal p-segment of length p contributes $p-2$ to $h_1 - 2r_1 + \epsilon_1$. On the other hand, since λ is p-regular, any non-horizontal p-segment of length p has height $\leq (p-1)$ and so it contributes at least $p - 2(p-1) = 2 - p$ to $h_1 - 2r_1 + \epsilon_1$. Suppose the p-rim also has a p-segment of length j less than p. Then it must be the last p-segment, and $\epsilon_1 = 1$. So the contribution of this p-segment to $h_1 - 2r_1 + \epsilon_1$ is $\geq j - 2j + 1 = 1 - j$.

As the p-rims are removed in succession, let a be the total number of horizontal p-segments of length p, b_p be the total number of non-horizontal p-segments of length p, and b_j be the total number of p-segments of length $1 \leq j < p$, so that $n = pa + \sum_{j=1}^{p} j b_j$. Applying the above arguments to all successive p-rims of λ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} (h_i - 2r_i + \epsilon_i) &\geq (p-2)a - (p-2)b_p - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} (j-1) b_j \\
&\geq (2p-2)a + (2b_p + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_j) - (pa + \sum_{j=1}^{p} j b_j) \\
&\geq (2p-2)a + (2b_p + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_j) - n.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$2b_p + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} b_j \geq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} j b_j}{p-1} = \frac{n - pa}{p-1}.$$

Under the hypothesis, we can find an integer $t \geq (n+1)/(2p-1)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \lfloor \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}}{p} \rfloor \geq t.$$

Now observe that at least t horizontal p-segments from the first s rows of λ belong to these successive p-rims. Thus $a \geq t \geq (n+1)/(2p-1)$. Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}(h_i - 2r_i + \epsilon_i) \geq (2p-2)a + \frac{n-pa}{p-1} - n \geq \frac{p-2}{p-1}((2p-1)a - n) > 0,$$

contradicting (4.3). □

5. Structure of permutation modules

Throughout the section $n \geq 6$ is an *even* integer and $p = 2$.

We will study permutation modules M_r, mainly for $r = 1, 2, 3$. For $n \geq 2r$, let $\mathcal{S}_r \subset M_r$ denote the Specht module $S^{(n-r,r)}$ and (assuming $n > 2r$) let $D_r = D^{(n-r,r)}$ be the unique simple quotient of $\mathcal{S}_r$. Let $T_r \in M_r$ be the sum of all r-element sets. Let

$$\eta_{r,s} : M_r \to M_s$$

denote the incidence homomorphism sending an r-set to the sum of s-sets incident with (i.e. containing or contained in) it. By [J2, Corollary 17.18],

$$\mathcal{S}_r = \cap_{t=0}^{r-1} \operatorname{Ker} \eta_{r,t}. \tag{5.1}$$

We denote by M_r' the *augmentation module*, i.e. the submodule $\operatorname{Ker} \eta_{r,0}$ of M_r (spanned by differences of pairs of basis elements).

The space M_r has a natural bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_r$, with respect to which the standard basis is orthonormal. If we identify M_r and M_s with their dual spaces, using the corresponding bilinear forms, then $\eta_{s,r}$ is the dual map of $\eta_{r,s}$. In particular, $\eta_{s,r}$ is injective iff $\eta_{r,s}$ is surjective and vice versa. Also $\operatorname{Im} \eta_{s,r} \cong \operatorname{Im} \eta_{r,s}^*$ as $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-modules. We have

$$\langle x, \eta_{r,s}(y) \rangle_s = \langle \eta_{s,r}(x), y \rangle_r \qquad (x \in M_s, y \in M_r). \tag{5.2}$$

The ranks of the maps $\eta_{r,s}$ are given in [Wil]. We state the special cases that we need of of this general result.

Lemma 5.1. *For $r \leq \min\{s, n-s\}$ we have*

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{F}} \eta_{r,s} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r,\ \binom{s-i}{r-i} \text{ is odd}} \left(\binom{n}{i} - \binom{n}{i-1} \right).$$

In particular, $\eta_{1,3}$ is injective, and

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{F}} \eta_{1,2} = n - 1 = \dim \mathcal{S}_1, \quad \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{F}} \eta_{2,3} = 1 + \frac{n(n-3)}{2} = 1 + \dim \mathcal{S}_2.$$

Lemma 5.2. *M_1 is a uniserial $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module with socle layers $\mathbb{F} \cdot T_1 \cong \mathbf{1}$, D_1, $\mathbf{1}$.*

Proof. This is well known and easy to show. □

Let $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module Q be defined by the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{F} \cdot T_1 \to M_1 \to Q \to 0. \tag{5.3}$$

In fact, $Q \cong \mathcal{S}_1^*$.

The following lemma can be deduced from [MO, Theorem (1.1)], but we give an independent proof for the reader's convenience:

Lemma 5.3. *As $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-modules, $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2} \cong Q$ and M_2 has the following structure:*

(i) *If $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$ then the composition factors of M_2 are $\mathbf{1}$ (twice), D_1 (twice) and D_2 (once). Furthermore, $M_2/(\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2} + \mathbb{F}\cdot T_2) \cong S_2^*$, whose socle is D_2.*

(ii) *If $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$ then $M_2 \cong \mathbb{F}\cdot T_2 \oplus M_2'$, and M_2' is uniserial with socle layers D_1, $\mathbf{1}$, D_2, $\mathbf{1}$, D_1.*

Proof. The dimension of $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2}$ is given by Lemma 5.1, from which we see that it is isomorphic to Q. The composition factors are given by [J1].

(i) The second statement in (i) now follows using the facts that the dual Specht module S_2^* is a quotient of M_2 and S_2^* is uniserial with socle layers D_2, D_1.

(ii) The submodule $\mathbb{F}\cdot T_2$ is a direct summand of M_2 because $\binom{n}{2}$ is odd. Then $M_2' = \operatorname{Ker}\eta_{2,0}$ is the complementary summand. The composition factors of M_2' are D_1, $\mathbf{1}$, D_2, $\mathbf{1}$, D_1. Also we have $\mathcal{S}_2 \subseteq M_2'$. The composition factors of $\mathcal{S}_2$ are D_2, D_1, $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ has a simple head isomorphic to D_2. Since ${M_2'}^{\mathsf{S}_n} = 0$, it follows that $\mathcal{S}_2$ must be uniserial with socle layers D_1, $\mathbf{1}$, D_2. The uniseriality of M_2' and its socle layers now follow from the self-duality of M_2'. □

Lemma 5.4. *The $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module M_3 has the following structure.*

(i) *If $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$, then $M_3 \cong M_1 \oplus U$, where U is uniserial with socle layers D_2, D_1, D_3, D_1, D_2.*

(ii) *If $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$ then $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$ is uniserial with socle layers $\mathbf{1}$, D_2, $\mathbf{1}$, D_1. The composition factors of M_3 are $\mathbf{1}$ (with multiplicity 4), D_1 (twice), D_2 (twice) and D_3 (once). Also, $\operatorname{soc}(M_3) = \mathbb{F}\cdot T_3$.*

Proof. The composition factors are given by [J1]. The dimensions of the images of the incidence maps $\eta_{r,s}$ are given by Lemma 5.1.

(i) A simple computation shows that $\eta_{3,1}\circ\eta_{1,3} = 1_{M_1}$, so $\eta_{1,3}$ is a split injection of M_1 into M_3. In fact, by computing bilinear forms on the images of basis elements, $\eta_{1,3}$ is seen to be an isometry. So $M_3 = \operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} \oplus U$, with $U = (\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3})^\perp = \operatorname{Ker}\eta_{3,1}$, where the last equality is by (5.2). The module U is a self-dual module and its composition factors are D_1 (twice), D_2 (twice) and D_3, and U contains $\mathcal{S}_3$. The structure of U will follow from its self-duality if we prove that $\mathcal{S}_3$ is uniserial with socle layers D_2, D_1, D_3. Since we know that the head of $\mathcal{S}_3$ is isomorphic to D_3, it suffices to show that D_1 is not a submodule of $\mathcal{S}_3$. If it were, then we would have $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(D_1, M_3) \neq 0$, whence $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_3, D_1) \neq 0$, i.e. the fixed point subspace $D_1^{\mathsf{S}_{n-3,3}}$ is non-trivial, which is easily checked to be false.

(ii) We have $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2} \cong Q$. Also, it is easy to see that $\eta_{2,3}\circ\eta_{1,2} = 0$, whence by dimensions using Lemma 5.1, we conclude that $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2} = \operatorname{Ker}\eta_{2,3}$. Moreover, $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2} \cong Q$ by Lemma 5.3. Since $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,2} \not\subseteq M_2'$, the structure of Q implies that $\operatorname{Ker}\eta_{2,3} \cap M_2'$ must be zero or isomorphic to D_1. Since we know the rank of $\eta_{2,3}$, we see that the latter holds. Thus from the structure of M_2', we see that $\eta_{2,3}(M_2') \cong M_2'/\operatorname{soc}(M_2')$. By dimensions, we see that $\eta_{2,3}(M_2') = \operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$, so $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$ is uniserial with the socle layers as stated.

It remains to show that $\operatorname{soc}(M_3) = \mathbb{F}\cdot T_3$. For this, it suffices to prove that M_3 has no submodule isomorphic to D_1, D_2 or D_3. For D_1 we explicitly check as in (i) that $D_1^{\mathsf{S}_{n-3,3}} = 0$. The unique D_3 composition factor of M_3 is the head of $\mathcal{S}_3$, so since $\mathcal{S}_3$ is not

simple, it follows that M_3 has no submodule isomorphic to D_3. Finally, we consider D_2. By the first part of (ii), $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$ has one composition factor D_2 as its second socle layer, so it suffices to show that $M_3/\operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$, which has a single D_2 composition factor, has no submodule isomorphic to D_2. However, $M_3/\operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$ has D_3 as a composition factor, so maps surjectively onto $\mathcal{S}_3^*$. By [J1], D_2 is a composition factor of $\mathcal{S}_3^*$, but $\mathcal{S}_3^*$ has a simple socle isomorphic to D_3. So D_2 is not a submodule of M_3. □

Figures 1 and 2 below are given for the reader's convenience, but they will not be used in proofs. The pictures give *partial* information on submodule structure of the permutation modules M_2 and M_3. The edges indicate the existence of uniserial subquotients.



FIGURE 1. Submodule structures for $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$



FIGURE 2. Submodule structures for $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$

Lemma 5.5. *We have:*

(i) $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3}$ *is the unique submodule of* M_3 *that is isomorphic to* M_1 *as* $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$*-modules.*
(ii) $\operatorname{Ker}\eta_{3,1}$ *is the unique submodule* N *of* M_3 *such that* $M_3/N \cong M_1$ *as* $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$*-modules.*

Proof. Part (ii) follows from (i) by the duality of $\eta_{1,3}$ and $\eta_{3,1}$. For (i), note that $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_1, M_3) = 2$. The map $\eta_{1,3}$ and the map β sending each 1-set to T_3 form a basis of this Hom-space. Now $\eta_{1,3}$ is injective since $\operatorname{soc}(M_1)$ is spanned by T_1 and $\eta_{1,3}(T_1) = 3T_3 = T_3 \neq 0$. Also we have $\operatorname{Im}\beta \subset \operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3}$, so $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3}$ is the unique submodule of M_3 isomorphic to M_1. □

In the following two lemmas, N denotes the submodule of M_3 specified in Lemma 5.5(ii).

Lemma 5.6. *Let $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$. Then $\operatorname{Ker}\eta_{3,2} \cap N = \operatorname{soc}^3(N)$, and*

$$N/\operatorname{soc}^3(N) \cong \eta_{3,2}(N) = \operatorname{Im}\eta_{3,2} \cap M_2' = \mathcal{S}_2.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.4, $N/\operatorname{soc}^3(N)$ is uniserial with socle D_1 and head D_2. Since M_2 has no composition factor isomorphic to D_3, we have $\operatorname{soc}^3(N) \subseteq \operatorname{Ker}\eta_{3,2}$.

We claim that the induced map $N/\operatorname{soc}^3(N) \to M_2$ is injective. If not, its image is either zero or isomorphic to D_2. The latter is impossible since M_2 has no submodule isomorphic to D_2. The former is also impossible since it forces the rank of $\eta_{3,2}$ to be at most $\dim M_1 = n$, contrary to Lemma 5.1, which gives the actual rank as $1 + \dim \mathcal{S}_2$.

Thus the map $\eta_{3,2}$ induces an isomorphism of $N/\operatorname{soc}^3(N)$ with a submodule $\eta_{3,2}(N) \subseteq M_2$. Since $N \subseteq M_3'$ and $\eta_{2,0} \circ \eta_{3,2} = \eta_{3,0}$, we have $\eta_{3,2}(N) \subseteq M_2'$. Comparing the dimensions, we see that $\eta_{3,2}(N) = \operatorname{Im}\eta_{3,2} \cap M_2'$. This submodule of M_2 has the same dimension and the same composition factors as $\mathcal{S}_2$. Since any submodule of M_2 with D_2 as a composition factor must contain $\mathcal{S}_2$, we now conclude that $\eta_{3,2}(N) = \mathcal{S}_2$. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$, $W = \operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3} \subseteq M_3$, and $Y := M_2' \subset M_2$. Then:*

(i) $\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \subseteq N$ *and* $\operatorname{soc}^2(W)$ *is uniserial with socle layers* $\mathbf{1}, D_2$.

(ii) $\operatorname{Ker}(\eta_{2,3}|_Y) = \operatorname{soc}(Y)$, *and* $Y/\operatorname{soc}(Y) \cong \eta_{2,3}(Y) = W$.

(iii) $N \cap W = N \cap \operatorname{soc}^3(W) = \operatorname{soc}^2(W)$, $M_3/(N + \operatorname{soc}^3(W)) \cong Q$.

(iv) *We have* $M_1 \cong \operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} \subseteq N$, $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} \cap W = \mathbb{F} \cdot T_3$, *and the submodule*

$$Q' := (\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} + \operatorname{soc}^2(W))/\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \subseteq N' := N/\operatorname{soc}^2(W)$$

is isomorphic to Q. Moreover, $N'' := N'/Q'$ is uniserial with socle layers D_3, D_2.

(v) *We have* $\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \subset \mathcal{S}_3 \subset N$, *the submodule* $D' := \mathcal{S}_3/\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \subset N'$ *is isomorphic to* D_3. *Moreover,* $\operatorname{soc}(N') = D' \oplus \operatorname{soc}(Q') \cong D_3 \oplus D_1$ *and* $N'/D' \cong N/\mathcal{S}_3 \cong \eta_{3,2}(N) \cong \mathcal{S}_2$.

Proof. (i) The structure of W is given in Lemma 5.4, which implies that $\operatorname{soc}^2(W)$ is uniserial with socle layers $\mathbf{1}, D_2$. Any nonzero quotient of $\operatorname{soc}^2(W)$ has D_2 as its head. But $M_3/N \cong M_1$ and D_2 is not a composition factor of M_1. So we see that $\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \subseteq N$.

(ii) Recall that $M_2 \cong Y \oplus \mathbf{1}$ and Y is uniserial with socle layers $D_1, \mathbf{1}, D_2, \mathbf{1}, D_1$ by Lemma 5.3. Next, $\eta_{2,3}(Y)$ has codimension ≤ 1 in $W = \operatorname{Im}\eta_{2,3}$. Inspecting the submodule structures of W and Y given in Lemma 5.4(ii) and Lemma 5.3, we see that $\eta_{2,3}(Y) = W$ and $\operatorname{Ker}(\eta_{2,3}|_Y) = \operatorname{soc}(Y)$.

(iii) Note that $\eta_{3,1} \circ \eta_{2,3} \neq 0$, so $W \not\subseteq \operatorname{Ker}\eta_{3,1} = N$. Moreover, $\operatorname{soc}^3(W) \not\subseteq N$, since otherwise $W \cap N = \operatorname{soc}^3(W)$, and $M_3/N \cong M_1$ contains $(W+N)/N \cong W/\operatorname{soc}^3(W) \cong D_1$ as a submodule, which is a contradiction. As W is uniserial and $\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \subseteq N$, it now follows that $N \cap W = N \cap \operatorname{soc}^3(W) = \operatorname{soc}^2(W)$. Now, $M_3/(N + \operatorname{soc}^3(W))$ is a quotient of $M_3/N \cong M_1$ by

$$(N + \operatorname{soc}^3(W))/N \cong \operatorname{soc}^3(W)/(N \cap \operatorname{soc}^3(W)) = \operatorname{soc}^3(W)/\operatorname{soc}^2(W) \cong \mathbf{1},$$

so this quotient must be isomorphic to Q.

(iv) We know that N' has composition factors D_3, D_2, D_1, and $\mathbf{1}$. It is easy to check that $\eta_{3,1} \circ \eta_{1,3} = 0$, so $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} \subseteq N = \operatorname{Ker}\eta_{3,1}$. By Lemma 5.5(i), $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} \cong M_1$. Using the submodule structure of W and $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3}$ and the fact that $\operatorname{soc}(M_3) = \mathbb{F} \cdot T_3$, we conclude that $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3} \cap W = \mathbb{F} \cdot T_3$. Therefore the image Q' of $\operatorname{Im}\eta_{1,3}$ in N' is isomorphic to Q.

Now we know that N'' has composition factors D_3 and D_2. Note that $\mathcal{S}_3^*$ is a quotient of M_3, so some submodule S' of $\mathcal{S}_3^*$ is a quotient of N. Also, D_3 is the head of $\mathcal{S}_3$ and the socle of $\mathcal{S}_3^*$. But D_3 is not a composition factor of $\mathrm{soc}^2(W)+\mathrm{Im}\,\eta_{1,3}$. It follows that $\mathcal{S}_3^*$ is a quotient of $M_3/(\mathrm{soc}^2(W)+\mathrm{Im}\,\eta_{1,3})$, whence S' is a quotient of $N/(\mathrm{soc}^2(W)+\mathrm{Im}\,\eta_{1,3}) = N''$ and also of N'. By [J1] the composition factors of $\mathcal{S}_3$ (and $\mathcal{S}_3^*$) are D_3, D_2, $\mathbf{1}$. Among these, only $\mathbf{1}$ is a composition factor of $M_1 \cong M_3/N$, so S' has both D_3 and D_2 as composition factors. We have shown that S' is a quotient of N'' which has exactly two composition factors D_3 and D_2. It follows that in fact $N'' \cong S'$. In this case, $\mathrm{soc}(N'') \cong D_3$ since $\mathrm{soc}(\mathcal{S}_3^*) \cong D_3$ is simple.

(v) Recall that $\mathcal{S}_3 \subset M_3$ and $\mathrm{head}(\mathcal{S}_3) \cong D_3$ is not a composition factor of $M_1 \cong M_3/N$. It follows that $\mathcal{S}_3 \subset N$ and, since D_1 is not a composition factor of $\mathcal{S}_3$, the image D' of $\mathcal{S}_3$ in N' intersects Q' trivially. The aforementioned structure of N'' implies that $\mathcal{S}_3$ has no quotient isomorphic to N''. Therefore, under the natural projection $N' \to N''$, D' projects onto a module isomorphic to D_3, or 0. The latter cannot happen since D_3 is not a composition factor of $\mathrm{soc}^2(W) + \mathrm{Im}\,\eta_{1,3}$. So D' projects onto a module isomorphic to D_3. This implies that the composition factors of $D'+Q'$ are D_3, D_1 ,$\mathbf{1}$. Since $D' \cap Q' = 0$ and $Q' \cong Q$, it follows that $D' \cong D_3$. We have shows that that $D_3 \oplus D_1 \cong D' \oplus \mathrm{soc}(Q') \subseteq \mathrm{soc}(N')$. On the other hand, $N'/Q' = N''$, $\mathrm{soc}(N'') \cong D_3$, and $\mathrm{soc}(Q') \cong D_1$. Together these imply that $\mathrm{soc}(N')$ embeds into $D_3 \oplus D_1$. So $D' \oplus \mathrm{soc}(Q') = \mathrm{soc}(N')$.

Let π denote the natural projection $N \to N'$. Then we have shown that $\mathrm{Ker}(\pi|_{\mathcal{S}_3})$ has two composition factors D_2 and $\mathbf{1}$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Ker}\,\pi = \mathrm{soc}^2(W)$. It follows that $\mathrm{Ker}(\pi|_{\mathcal{S}_3}) = \mathrm{soc}^2(W)$ so that in fact $D' = \mathcal{S}_3/\mathrm{soc}^2(W)$ and $N'/D' \cong N/\mathcal{S}_3$. By (5.1) we have $\mathcal{S}_3 = N \cap \mathrm{Ker}\,\eta_{3,2}$. So $N/\mathcal{S}_3 = N/(\mathrm{Ker}\,\eta_{3,2} \cap N) \cong \eta_{3,2}(N)$ is a submodule of M_2 with composition factors D_1, $\mathbf{1}$, D_2, which are precisely the composition factors of $\mathcal{S}_2$. Hence, $N'/D' \cong N/\mathcal{S}_3 = \eta_{3,2}(N) = \mathcal{S}_2$. □

6. Main reduction theorem

The following theorem is the main tool for proving reducibility of various restrictions $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X$ in the key case $p = 2|n$. Note by Theorem 3.2 that the assumption $d_3(V) > d_1(V)$ is equivalent to the assumption that V is not trivial and not basic spin module.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $p = 2|n \geq 6$, V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module satisfying $d_3(V) > d_1(V)$, and X be a subgroup of S_n. Let N be the $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-submodule of M_3 specified in Lemma 5.5(ii). Suppose that for any nonzero $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-quotient J of N we have $J^X \neq 0$ and if $J^{\mathsf{S}_n} \neq 0$ then $\dim J^X \geq 2$. Then the restriction $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X V$ is reducible.*

Proof. Set $E := \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$ so that $d_r(V) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_r, E)$. By Schur's Lemma, $\dim E^{\mathsf{S}_n} = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(V) = 1$, so the $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module E contains a unique submodule $E_1 \cong \mathbf{1}$. Note that $E^X = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{F}X}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X V)$, so it suffices to prove that $\dim E^X \geq 2$.

By definition of N in Lemma 5.5(ii), we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to N \to M_3 \to M_1 \to 0.$$

Applying $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(-, E)$ to this sequence and using the assumption $d_3(V) > d_1(V)$, we conclude that there is some $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n}(M_3, E)$ such that $J := f(N) \neq 0$.

If $J \cap E_1 = 0$, then E contains a submodule isomorphic to $J \oplus E_1$, whence $\dim E^X \geq 2$ as $J^X \neq 0$ by assumption. On the other hand, if $J \cap E_1 \neq 0$ then $J^{\mathsf{S}_n} \neq 0$. In this case $\dim E^X \geq \dim J^X \geq 2$ by assumption again. □

Our main goal now will be to obtain permutation group theoretic conditions on the subgroup X which guarantee that the assumptions of Theorem 6.1 hold.

To bound dimensions of various fixed point subspaces, we will frequently use the following well-known estimates:

Lemma 6.2. *Let X be a group and $U \supseteq V$ be $\mathbb{F}X$-modules. Then:*

(i) $\dim(U/V)^X - \dim H^1(X,V) \leq \dim U^X - \dim V^X \leq \dim(U/V)^X$.

(ii) *If in addition X acts trivially on V and $\mathrm{Hom}(X,\mathbb{F}) = 0$, then*

$$\dim U^X = \dim V + \dim(U/V)^X.$$

Proof. (i) follows from the exact sequence $0 \to V^X \to U^X \to (U/V)^X \to H^1(X,V)$.

(ii) In this case $H^1(X,V) = \mathrm{Hom}(X,\mathbb{F}) = 0$, whence the statement follows from (i). □

Let $X \leq \mathsf{S}_n$ be any subgroup and $1 \leq r \leq n/2$. We set

$$f_r(X) := \dim(M_r)^X, \quad f_0(X) := 0, \quad e_r(X) := f_r(X) - f_{r-1}(X). \tag{6.1}$$

Note that $f_r(X)$ is the number of X-orbits on Ω_r. Recalling the module Q defined in (5.3), when $p = 2|n$ we also put

$$h(X) := \dim H^1(X, Q). \tag{6.2}$$

For any partition $\lambda \vdash n$, let χ^λ denote the irreducible ordinary S_n-character labeled by λ. It is well known that the S_n-character afforded by the permutation module $\mathbb{C}\Omega_r$ is $\sum_{s=0}^r \chi^{(n-s,s)}$. Denote $\alpha := \chi^{(n-1,1)}$, so that $\alpha + 1_{\mathsf{S}_n}$ is the permutation character of S_n acting on $\Omega := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Applying [GT2, Lemma 3.3], we see that

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r} \chi^{(n-s,s)} = \begin{cases} S^2(\alpha) & \text{if } r = 2, \\ S^3(\alpha) - \wedge^2(\alpha) - \alpha & \text{if } r = 3, \end{cases}$$

where S^k denotes the kth symmetric power and $\wedge^k$ denotes the kth exterior power. If we know the restriction $\alpha_X := \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X \alpha$ explicitly, we can compute $f_2(X)$ and $f_3(X)$ by computing the scalar product of X-characters as follows:

$$f_2(X) = [S^2(\alpha_X), 1_X]_X, \ f_3(X) = [(S^3(\alpha_X) - \wedge^2(\alpha_X) - \alpha_X, 1_X]_X. \tag{6.3}$$

Next we record some obvious observations:

Lemma 6.3. *Let $X \leq \mathsf{S}_n$ be a transitive subgroup. Then:*

(i) *$f_2(X) = 1$ if and only if X is 2-homogeneous.*

(ii) *Suppose $|X|$ is even. Then $f_2(X) = 1$ if and only if X is 2-transitive.*

(iii) *$f_2(X) \leq 2$ if X is a rank ≤ 3 subgroup of S_n.*

Proof. (i) is obvious: X is 2-homogeneous precisely when it acts transitively on Ω_2. For (ii), observe that X contains an involution t, and so we can find $x, y \in \Omega$ interchanged by t. It follows that X is 2-homogeneous precisely when it is 2-transitive.

For (iii), note that if X is a rank 2 subgroup $f_2(X) = 1$ by (ii). If X is a rank 3 subgroup, then the point stabilizer of $x \in \Omega$ in X has two orbits on $\Omega \setminus \{x\}$, whence X has at most two orbits on Ω_2. □

Note that since $p = 2$ in the following proposition, the condition $X = O^2(X)$ is equivalent to the condition $\mathrm{Hom}(X, \mathbb{F}) = 0$ from Lemma 6.2. In many applications X will be perfect, in which case this assumption of course holds.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $p = 2|n \geq 6$, N the $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-submodule of M_3 specified in Lemma 5.5(ii), and let J be any nonzero $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-quotient of N. Suppose that $X = O^2(X) \leq \mathsf{S}_n$ is a subgroup such that*

$$f_1(X) = 1,\ e_3(X) \geq h(X) + 1,\ \textit{and either } f_2(X) \geq 3 \textit{ or } \mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0.$$

Then $J^X \neq 0$. Moreover, if $J^{\mathsf{S}_n} \neq 0$, then $\dim J^X \geq 2$.

Proof. We write f_r for $f_r(X)$, e_r for $e_r(X)$, and h for $h(X)$. Note that $Q^X = 0$ and $D_1^X = 0$ since $f_1 = 1$ and $X = O^2(X)$. Combining this with the structure of M_2 given in Lemma 5.3 and applying Lemma 6.2, we see that

$$f_2 \geq 1 + \dim D_2^X - \dim H^1(X, Q) = 1 + \dim D_2^X - h. \tag{6.4}$$

Note that $D_2^X \neq 0$. Indeed, if $f_2 \geq 3$, this follows by considering composition factors of M_2 described in Lemma 5.3 and using $Q^X = D_1^X = 0$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0$, this follows by considering composition factors of $\mathcal{S}_2$ using $D_1^X = 0$.

Case 1: $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$. Then N is uniserial by Lemma 5.4, and we are going to check that $J^X \neq 0$ for each of its five non-trivial quotients J. This is all we have to do, since $\mathbf{1}$ is not a composition factor of N, and so we never have $J^{\mathsf{S}_n} \neq 0$.

Note that $\mathrm{soc}(N) \cong D_2$, so $N^X \supseteq D_2^X \neq 0$. By assumption, we have $f_3 \geq f_2 + h + 1$, so (6.4) implies $f_3 \geq \dim D_2^X + 2$. Since $M_3 = M_1 \oplus N$ and $f_1 = 1$, it follows that $(N/\mathrm{soc}(N))^X \neq 0$. Then since $D_1^X = 0$, we also get $(N/\mathrm{soc}^2(N))^X \neq 0$. Next, $N/\mathrm{soc}^3(N) \cong \mathcal{S}_2$ by Lemma 5.6. If $\mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0$, we are done. Otherwise, the conditions $f_2 \geq 3$ and $D_1^X = 0$ imply that $(N/\mathrm{soc}^3(N))^X \neq 0$. Finally, $N/\mathrm{rad}(N) \cong D_2$ and we already have $D_2^X \neq 0$.

Case 2: $n \equiv 0 \pmod 4$. We are going to use the notation of Lemma 5.7.

Step 1: we prove that $J^X \neq 0$ for any nonzero quotient $J = N/K$ of N.

By Lemma 5.7(i), we have the submodule $\mathrm{soc}^2(W) \subset N$ which is uniserial with socle layers $\mathbf{1}, D_2$. So any nonzero quotient of $\mathrm{soc}^2(W)$ either contains $\mathbf{1}$ or is isomorphic to D_2, hence it contains nonzero X-fixed points. In particular, $(N/K)^X > 0$ if $\mathrm{soc}^2(W) \not\subseteq K$, and we may now assume that $\mathrm{soc}^2(W) \subseteq K$. In other words, we are reduced to showing that X has nonzero fixed points on every nonzero $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-quotient of $N' = N/\mathrm{soc}^2(W)$.

Recall that $M_2 \cong Y \oplus \mathbf{1}$, see Lemma 5.7. In particular, $\dim Y^X = f_2 - 1$, and so $\dim(\mathrm{soc}^4(Y))^X = f_2 - 1$, since X has no fixed points on $U/\mathrm{soc}^4(U) \cong D_1$. Applying

Lemma 6.2(i) to the exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{soc}^2(Y) \to \operatorname{soc}^4(Y) \to \operatorname{soc}^4(Y)/\operatorname{soc}^2(Y) \to 0$$

with $(\operatorname{soc}^2(Y))^X \cong Q^X = 0$, we see that

$$\dim(\operatorname{soc}^4(Y)/\operatorname{soc}^2(Y))^X \leq f_2 + h - 1. \tag{6.5}$$

By Lemma 5.7(ii), we have $\eta_{2,3}(Y) = W \cong Y/\operatorname{soc}(Y)$. So $\operatorname{soc}^3(W) \cong \operatorname{soc}^4(Y)/\operatorname{soc}(Y)$ is an extension of $\operatorname{soc}^4(Y)/\operatorname{soc}^2(Y)$ by $\operatorname{soc}^2(Y)/\operatorname{soc}(Y) \cong \mathbf{1}$. Together with (6.5) and Lemma 6.2, this implies that

$$\dim(\operatorname{soc}^3(W))^X \leq f_2 + h. \tag{6.6}$$

Since $Q^X = 0$, Lemma 5.7(iii) yields

$$\dim(N + \operatorname{soc}^3(W))^X = f_3. \tag{6.7}$$

Moreover, by the same lemma, we have

$$N' = N/\operatorname{soc}^2(W) = N/(N \cap \operatorname{soc}^3(W)) \cong (N + \operatorname{soc}^3(W))/\operatorname{soc}^3(W).$$

Since $f_3 - f_2 = e_3 \geq h + 1$ we deduce from (6.6) and (6.7) that $(N')^X \neq 0$.

Now we apply Lemma 5.7(iv). Since $N'' = N'/Q'$ and $Q'^X \cong Q^X = 0$, we have that $(N')^X \neq 0$ implies $N''^X \neq 0$. Recalling that $D_2^X \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{head}(N'') \cong D_2$, we have now shown that X has nonzero fixed points on every nonzero quotient of N''.

It remains to consider quotients of N' by nonzero submodules R' which do not contain Q'. Since Q' has a simple socle and $Q'/\operatorname{soc}(Q') \cong \mathbf{1}$, we only need to consider R' such that $R' \cap Q' = 0$. We have shown in Lemma 5.7(v) that $\operatorname{soc}(N') = D' \oplus \operatorname{soc}(Q')$. Hence the condition $R' \cap Q' = 0$ implies that $R' \supseteq D'$. So we must show that X has nonzero fixed points on every nonzero quotient of the $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module $N'/D' \cong \mathcal{S}_2$, see Lemma 5.7(v) again. By assumption, $\mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0$ unless $f_2 \geq 3$, in which case $D_1^X = 0$ implies $\mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0$. The only proper quotients of $\mathcal{S}_2$ have socles $\mathbf{1}$ and D_2 and we have seen already that X has non-trivial fixed points on these simple modules.

Step 2: we assume that $J = N/K$ contains a trivial S_n-submodule $E \cong \mathbf{1}$ and prove that $\dim J^X \geq 2$. We again use the notation of Lemma 5.7. Since we have shown that $D_2^X, (N'')^X \neq 0$, by Lemma 6.2(ii) it suffices to show that J contains an $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-submodule L where L/E is isomorphic to D_2 or N''. This is obvious if $K = 0$. So we may assume that $K \supseteq \operatorname{soc}(W) = \operatorname{soc}(N) \cong \mathbf{1}$.

If $K \cap \operatorname{soc}^2(W) = \operatorname{soc}(W)$, then J contains $\operatorname{soc}^2(W)/\operatorname{soc}(W) \cong D_2$, and we can take $L \cong D_2 \oplus E$. Thus we may assume that $K \supseteq \operatorname{soc}^2(W)$ and so J can be regarded as a quotient N'/K' of $N' = N/\operatorname{soc}^2(W)$. Let P' be the preimage of E in N' so that $E \cong P'/K'$. Since $\mathbf{1}$ is not a composition factor of N'/Q', we see that $Q' + K' \supseteq P'$, whence $Q'/(Q' \cap K') \cong (Q' + K')/K'$ contains $E = P'/K'$. But Q' has socle layers $D_1, \mathbf{1}$, so $Q' \cap K' = \operatorname{soc}(Q')$ and $P' = Q' + K'$. Recall that $N'/Q' = N''$ is uniserial with socle layers D_3, D_2. So if $P' \neq N'$ then $J \cong N'/K'$ is isomorphic to an extension of the nonzero quotient N'/P' of $N'/Q' \cong N''$ by $P'/K' = E$, and we may take $L = J$.

Assume $P' = N'$, so that $N'/K' \cong \mathbf{1}$. Since $D' \cong D_3$ is simple, it follows that $D' \subset K'$. Now we see that $N'/K' \cong \mathbf{1}$ is a quotient of N'/D' which is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_2$ by Lemma 5.7(v), a contradiction since $\operatorname{head}(\mathcal{S}_2) \cong D_2$. □

Now we can prove the main result of this section:

Theorem 6.5. *Let $p = 2|n \geq 6$, V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module satisfying $d_3(V) > d_1(V)$, and $X = O^2(X) \leq \mathsf{S}_n$ be a subgroup such that*

$$f_1(X) = 1,\ e_3(X) \geq h(X) + 1,\ \text{and either } f_2(X) \geq 3 \text{ or } \mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0.$$

Then the restriction $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X V$ is reducible.

Proof. Apply Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 6.4. □

Next we show that the condition $\mathcal{S}_2^X \neq 0$ is a fairly mild condition which *always* holds for rank 3 permutation groups of even degree n:

Lemma 6.6. *Let $2|n \geq 6$ and let $G \leq \mathsf{S}_n$ be a rank 3 permutation group. Then $\mathcal{S}_2^G \neq 0$.*

Proof. Since $2|n$, $|G|$ is even and so G contains an involution j. Choose $x_0 \in \Omega = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ *not* fixed by j. By assumption, the stabilizer G_{x_0} of x_0 has two orbits Δ_1, Δ_2 on $\Omega \setminus \{x_0\}$. Since $|\Delta_1| + |\Delta_2| = n - 1$ is odd, we may assume that $|\Delta_1|$ is odd and $|\Delta_2|$ is even. Since $|G|$ is even, it follows by Lemma 6.3(ii), (iii) that G has exactly two orbits Φ and Ψ on the set Ω_2 of 2-subsets $\{x, y\}$ of Ω, where $\{x_0, z\} \in \Psi$ if and only $z \in \Delta_2$. Note that

$$|\Phi| = n|\Delta_1|/2,\ |\Psi| = n|\Delta_2|/2.$$

(Indeed, suppose for instance that $j(x_0) =: z \in \Delta_1$. By counting we see that the number of *ordered* pairs (x, y) with $\{x, y\} \in \Phi$ is $n|\Delta_1|$. Since j interchanges x_0 and z, it follows that $|\Phi| = n|\Delta_1|/2$ and so $|\Psi| = n|\Delta_2|/2$. The same argument applies if $z \in \Delta_2$.)

Now $\Phi \cup \Psi$ forms a basis for M_2. Since Ψ is a G-orbit, it suffices to show that the orbit sum $\hat{\Psi} := \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\Psi}\{x, y\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_2$. A standard fact about Specht modules following from (5.1) and (5.2) is that

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \langle T_2\rangle^\perp \cap \eta_{1,2}(M_1)^\perp,$$

where perpendicularity is with respect to the natural inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_2$ on M_2. Now,

$$\langle\hat{\Psi}, T_2\rangle_2 = |\Psi| = n|\Delta_2|/2 \equiv 0(\mathrm{mod}2).$$

Next,

$$\langle\hat{\Psi}, \eta_{1,2}(x_0)\rangle_2 = |\Delta_2| \equiv 0(\mathrm{mod}2),$$

and similarly $\langle\hat{\Psi}, \eta_{1,2}(x)\rangle_2 = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$. □

7. Special embeddings of A_m into A_n

Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ with $m \geq 5$. In this section, we consider two *special* kinds of embeddings of X into symmetric groups S_n. The first arises from the action of X on k-subsets of

$$\Delta := \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$$

with $2 \leq k < m/2$, giving rise to an embedding of X into S_n, where $n = \binom{m}{k}$. The second embedding comes from the action on set partitions of Δ into b subsets of size a, where $m = ab$. This gives rise to an embedding into S_n, where $n = (ab)!/((a!)^b \cdot b!)$.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that $m \geq 8$. Then for any of the two special embeddings, we have that $n \geq m(m-1)/2$.*

Proof. For the first embedding, observe that the sequence $\binom{m}{k}$ is increasing for $2 \leq k < m/2$, whence $\binom{m}{k} \geq \binom{m}{2}$. For the second embedding, denote $N_{a,b} := (ab)!/((a!)^b \cdot b!)$ and observe that

$$\frac{N_{a,b+1}}{N_{a,b}} = \frac{(ab+1)(ab+2)\dots(ab+a-1)}{(a-1)!} \geq ab+1 \geq 5 \tag{7.1}$$

as long as $a, b \geq 2$. An induction on a shows that $N_{a,2} > \binom{2a}{2}$ for $a \geq 4$. Now another induction on $b \geq 2$ using (7.1) shows that $N_{a,b} > \binom{ab}{2}$ whenever $a \geq 4$ and $b \geq 2$. Next, an induction on a shows that $N_{a,3} \geq \binom{3a}{2}$ for $a \geq 2$, with equality only when $a = 2$. Now another induction on $b \geq 3$ using (7.1) shows that $N_{a,b} > \binom{ab}{2}$ if $a \geq 2$, $b \geq 3$, and $ab \geq 8$. □

Recall that the S_n-module Q defined in (5.3) and the integer $h(X)$ defined in (6.2).

Lemma 7.2. *Let $p = 2$. We have:*

(i) $\dim H^2(X, \mathbb{F}) = 1$.

(ii) *If n is even, then one of the following statements holds:*
   (a) $\dim H^1(X, M_1) = 1$ *and* $h(X) \leq 2$.
   (b) $4|m$, A_m *embeds into* A_n *via its action on partitions* $(m/2, m/2)$ *of* Δ, *and* $\dim H^1(X, M_1) = 2$, $h(X) \leq 3$.

Proof. (i) is a well-known fact about the Schur multiplier of A_m.

(ii) By Frobenius reciprocity we have that

$$H^1(X, M_1) \cong H^1(X_1, \mathbb{F}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(X_1, (\mathbb{F}, +)),$$

where X_1 is the stabilizer in X of a point on the set Ω, and $(\mathbb{F}, +)$ is the additive group of the field $\mathbb{F}$. First we consider the case where X is acting on k-sets of Δ. Then

$$X_1 = (\mathsf{S}_k \times \mathsf{S}_{m-k}) \cap \mathsf{A}_m \cong (\mathsf{A}_k \times \mathsf{A}_{m-k}) \cdot 2.$$

Since $p = 2$, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{A}_s, (\mathbb{F}, +)) = 0$ for all $s \geq 1$. Denoting by C_2 the group of order 2, it follows that $\mathrm{Hom}(X_1, (\mathbb{F}, +)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(C_2, (\mathbb{F}, +))$ is one-dimensional.

Next we consider the case X is acting on set partitions of Δ into $b \geq 2$ subsets of size $a = m/b \geq 2$. Then

$$X_1 = (\mathsf{S}_a \wr \mathsf{S}_b) \cap \mathsf{A}_m.$$

We may assume that the transposition $(1, 2)$ fixes the set partition fixed by X_1. Then $(1, 2)$ belongs to the base subgroup $B = \mathsf{S}_a^b$, whence $[B : B \cap X_1] = 2$ and $X_1 \cong (B \cap X_1) \cdot \mathsf{S}_b$. As mentioned above, $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{A}_a, (\mathbb{F}, +)) = 0$. Hence

$$\mathrm{Hom}(X_1, (\mathbb{F}, +)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(X_1/\mathsf{A}_a^b, (\mathbb{F}, +)) = \mathrm{Hom}(Y, (\mathbb{F}, +)),$$

where $Y = X_1/\mathsf{A}_a^b \cong 2^{b-1} \cdot \mathsf{S}_b$. If $b \geq 3$, then one can check that $[Y, Y]$ contains the normal subgroup 2^{b-1}, and so

$$\mathrm{Hom}(Y, (\mathbb{F}, +)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{S}_b, (\mathbb{F}, +)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(C_2, (\mathbb{F}, +)) \cong \mathbb{F}$$

as $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{A}_b, (\mathbb{F}, +)) = 0$. Assume that $b = 2$, i.e. X_1 fixes the partition $\Delta = \{1, 2, \dots, a\} \cup \{a+1, \dots, m\}$. If $a \geq 3$ is odd, then the permutation

$$g \ : \ (1, a+1, 2, a+2)(3, a+3)\dots(a, 2a)$$

belongs to X_1 and $g^2 = (1,2)(a+1,a+2)$ gives rise to an involution in Y. Thus Y is cyclic of order 4, and so again $\mathrm{Hom}(Y,(\mathbb{F},+)) \cong \mathbb{F}$. If a is even, then Y (of order 4) is generated by two involutions $(1,2)(a+1,a+2)$ and $(1,a+1)(2,a+2)\dots(a,2a)$, whence $\mathrm{Hom}(Y,(\mathbb{F},+)) \cong \mathbb{F}^2$. This proves the claims on $\dim H^1(X,M_1)$ in (ii).

Now the bounds on $h(X)$ in (ii) follow immediately from the portion

$$0 = H^1(X,\mathbb{F}) \to H^1(X,M_1) \to H^1(X,Q) \to H^2(X,\mathbb{F})$$

of the long exact sequence arising from (5.3). □

Lemma 7.3. *Let X embed into S_n via its action on k-subsets of Δ for $2 \le k < m/2$. Then $f_2(X) = k$.*

Proof. We claim that the orbits of X or of S_m on pairs $\{A,B\}$ of distinct k-subsets of Δ are labeled by $j := |A \cap B|$ for $0 \le j \le k-1$, hence $f_2(X) = k$. Indeed, the claim is obvious for S_m. Since $A \ne B$, we can find $i \in A \setminus B$ and $j \in B \setminus A$. Now the transposition (i,j) fixes the pair $\{A,B\}$, and so S_m and A_m have the same orbits on pairs $\{A,B\}$. □

Next we handle the embedding of A_m into A_n via its action on 2-subsets:

Corollary 7.4. *Let $p = 2$ and $m \ge 6$ be such that $n := \binom{m}{2}$ is even. Let $X = \mathsf{A}_m$ embed into A_n via its action on 2-subsets of $\{1,2,\dots,m\}$. Suppose that an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module V satisfies the condition $d_3(V) > d_1(V)$. Then $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X V$ is reducible.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.2(ii), we have that $h(X) \le 2$. On the other hand, $f_1(X) = 1$, and $f_2(X) = 2$ by Lemma 7.3. Also, $f_3(X) \ge 5$. Indeed, we can regard the $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-permutation module M_1 as having a basis consisting of all 2-subsets $\{i,j\}$ of $\Delta = \{1,2,\dots,m\}$. Then the module M_3 has a basis consisting of unordered triples of distinct pairs, and S_m has 5 orbits on this set represented by the triples

$$\{\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{5,6\}\}, \qquad \{\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{4,5\}\}, \qquad \{\{1,2\},\{2,4\},\{3,4\}\}$$
$$\{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{1,4\}\}, \qquad \{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\}\}.$$

In particular, $e_3(X) \ge 3 \ge h(X)+1$; furthermore, $\mathcal{S}_2^X \ne 0$ by Lemma 6.6. Hence we are done by Theorem 6.5. □

Lemma 7.5. *Suppose that $m \ge 11$. Then $e_2(X) \ge 2$, unless A_m embeds in A_n via its action on 2-subsets of Δ, in which case $e_2(X) = 1$.*

Proof. Recall that $f_1(X) = 1$ for the special embeddings of X into S_n in question. Now for the action of X on k-subsets of Δ the result follows from Lemma 7.3.

Now let X act on partitions $P = \{P_1,\dots,P_b\}$ of Δ into b a-subsets $P_1,\dots,P_b$. We will exhibit at least 3 orbits of X on pairs of partitions $\{P,Q\}$. Note that Δ admits two partitions with no common subset between them. It follows that, for each $j = 0,1,\dots,b-2$, Δ admits a pair of partitions $\{P,Q\}$, where P and Q contain exactly j common subsets. Certainly, such pairs with different parameters j belong to different S_m-orbits. In particular, we are done if $b \ge 4$.

Suppose $b = 3$ and $a \ge 4$. Then we get at least one orbit with the above parameter $j = 0$. For $j = 1$, we get at least two orbits with representatives $\{P,Q\}$, where $P = \{P_1,P_2,R\}$, $Q = \{Q_1,Q_2,R\}$, and $|P_1 \cap Q_1| = 1$, respectively $|P_1 \cap Q_1| = 2$.

Suppose $b = 2$ and $a \geq 6$. Then for each $s = 1, 2, 3$ we get at least one orbit with representatives $\{P, Q\}$, where $P = \{P_1, P_2\}$, $Q = \{Q_1, Q_2\}$, and $|P_1 \cap Q_1| = s$. □

Remark 7.6. It is easy to check that for the embedding via the action of X on b a-subsets, we have $e_2(X) = 0$ if $(a, b) = (3, 2)$, and $e_2 = 1$ if $(a, b) = (2, 3)$, $(4, 2)$, or $(5, 2)$. On the other hand, $e_2(X) = 3$ if $(a, b) = (3, 3)$, as one can compute using (6.3) below and [GAP].

Lemma 7.7. *Suppose $m \geq 6$ and $X = \mathsf{A}_m$ embeds into S_n via its action on k-subsets of Δ for $2 \leq k < m/2$. Then either $e_3(X) \geq 4$, or $k = 2$ and $e_3(X) = 3$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.3, we have $f_2(X) = k$. So we will try to exhibit at least $(k + 4)$ S_m-orbits on triples $\{A, B, C\}$ of k-subsets. We may assume that

$$|A \cap B| \geq |A \cap C| \geq |B \cap C|$$

and call $(|A \cap B|, |A \cap C|, |B \cap C|)$ the *mark* of the triple $\{A, B, C\}$. Certainly, triples with different marks belong to different S_m-orbits.

Recall that $m \geq 2k + 1$. First let $|A \cap B| = k - 1$, so we may assume

$$A = \{1, 2, \ldots, k-1, k\},\ B = \{1, 2, \ldots, k-1, k+1\}.$$

For $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$, by choosing

$$C = \{1, 2, \ldots, j, k+2, k+3, \ldots, 2k+1-j\}$$

we get a triple with the mark $(k - 1, j, j)$. Similarly, for $1 \leq j \leq k - 1$, by choosing

$$C = \{1, 2, \ldots, j-1, k, k+2, k+3, \ldots, 2k+1-j\}$$

we get a triple with the mark $(k - 1, j, j - 1)$.

Next we consider the case $|A \cap B| = k - 2$, say

$$A = \{1, 2, \ldots, k-2, k-1, k\},\ B = \{1, 2, \ldots, k-2, k+1, k+2\}.$$

For $1 \leq j \leq k - 2$, by choosing

$$C = \{1, 2, \ldots, j, k+3, k+4, \ldots, 2k+2-j\}$$

we get a triple with the mark $(k - 2, j, j)$. Similarly, for $1 \leq j \leq k - 2$, by choosing

$$C = \{1, 2, \ldots, j-1, k, k+2, k+3, \ldots, 2k+2-j\}$$

we get a triple with the mark $(k - 2, j, j - 1)$.

We have produced at least $4k - 5$ different marks. So we have $e_3(X) \geq 3k - 5 \geq 4$ if $k \geq 3$.

Finally, consider the case $k = 2$. Then the triples

$$\{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{2,4\}\},\ \{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{4,5\}\},\ \{\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{5,6\}\}$$

have marks $(1, 1, 0)$, $(1, 0, 0)$, and $(0, 0, 0)$. Furthermore, the triples $\{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{1,4\}\}$ and $\{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\}\}$ have the same mark $(1, 1, 1)$, but different cardinality of $A \cup B \cup C$, so they produce two more S_m-orbits. □

To estimate $e_3(X)$ for the second special embedding of X into S_n, we need the following observation:

Lemma 7.8. *Let Y be any group and $\mathbb{K}$ any field. Suppose that A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 are $\mathbb{K}Y$-modules such that there is an injective $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{K}Y}(A, B)$ with $A = A_1 \oplus A_2$, $B = B_1 \oplus B_2$, and $f(A_2) \subseteq B_2$. Then*

$$\dim B^Y - \dim A^Y \geq \dim B_1^Y - \dim A_1^Y.$$

Proof. Clearly, $A^Y = A_1^Y \oplus A_2^Y$ and $B^Y = B_1^Y \oplus B_2^Y$. Now f embeds A_2^Y in B_2^Y, whence the claim. □

The following statement is also well known and follows for example from the formula for $\mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{K}} \eta_{2,3}$ given in [Wil]:

Lemma 7.9. *Let $p \neq 2, 3$ and $n \geq 4$. Then $\eta_{2,3} : M_2 \to M_3$ is injective.* □

Now we can prove a reduction lemma to help estimate $e_3(X)$ for the second special embedding.

Lemma 7.10. *Let $X = \mathsf{A}_m$ and $Y := \mathsf{S}_m$ embed into S_n via their actions on partitions of $\Delta = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ into b a-subsets, with $a, b \geq 2$. Suppose that $b > s \geq 2$. Set $n' := (sa)!/((a!)^s \cdot s!)$ and let $Z := \mathsf{S}_{sa}$ embed in $\mathsf{S}_{n'}$ via its action on partitions of $\Delta' = \{1, 2, \ldots, sa\}$ into s a-subsets. Also denote by N_r the permutation $\mathsf{S}_{n'}$-module corresponding to its action on r-subsets of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n'\}$. Then*

$$\dim M_3^X - \dim M_2^X \geq \dim N_3^Z - \dim N_2^Z.$$

Proof. 1) Since M_r is a permutation module, $\dim M_r^X$ remains unchanged when we replace $\mathbb{F}$ by any other field. So throughout this proof we may assume $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$.

With respect to X and Y, any pair $\{P, Q\}$ in Ω_2 is a pair of two partitions

$$P = \{P_1, \ldots, P_a\},\ Q = \{Q_1, \ldots, Q_a\}.$$

Call $\{P, Q\}$ a *good pair* if at least $b - s$ subsets P_i occur among the Q_j. Next, we call a triple $\{P, Q, R\} \in \Omega_3$ with $R = \{R_1, \ldots, R_a\}$ a *good triple* if all three pairs $\{P, Q\}$, $\{P, R\}$, $\{Q, R\}$ are good. We also call $\{P, Q, R\}$ a *very good triple* if there are at least $b - s$ subsets P_i which occur both among the Q_j and among the R_j. Then $Y > X$ acts on the following sets: Ω_{21} of all good pairs, $\Omega_{22} := \Omega_2 \setminus \Omega_{21}$, Ω_{31} of all good triples, and $\Omega_{32} := \Omega_3 \setminus \Omega_{31}$. Thus

$$A_1 := \mathbb{C}\Omega_{21},\ A_2 := \mathbb{C}\Omega_{22},\ B_1 := \mathbb{C}\Omega_{31},\ B_2 := \mathbb{C}\Omega_{32}$$

are $\mathbb{C}Y$-submodules of $M_2 = A_1 \oplus A_2$ and $M_3 = B_1 \oplus B_2$. Note that $Y > X$ also acts on the set Ω_{311} of *very good* triples, and so $B_{11} := \mathbb{C}\Omega_{311}$ is an X-submodule of B_1. Certainly, $B_{11}^X \subseteq B_1^X$.

Since $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{C}) = 0$, $\eta_{2,3}$ is injective by Lemma 7.9. Next, if $\{P, Q\} \in \Omega_{22}$, then

$$\eta_{2,3}(\{P, Q\}) = \sum_{R \neq P,Q} \{P, Q, R\},$$

where all occuring triples $\{P, Q, R\}$ are not good (since $\{P, Q\}$ is not good). Thus $\eta_{2,3}(\{P, Q\}) \in B_2$. We have shown that $\eta_{2,3}(A_2) \subseteq B_2$. Applying Lemma 7.8 to the homomorphism $f = \eta_{2,3}$, we see that

$$\dim M_3^X - \dim M_2^X \geq \dim B_1^X - \dim A_1^X \geq \dim B_{11}^X - \dim A_1^X.$$

Recall that $b > s$. Hence, for any good pair $\{P, Q\}$, P and Q have at least one common a-subset P_1, and since $a \geq 2$, some transposition $(i, j) \in Y \setminus X$ fixes both P and Q. It follows that X and Y have the same orbits on good pairs. Similarly, X and Y have the same orbits on *very good* triples. Thus

$$\dim B_{11}^X - \dim A_1^X = \dim B_{11}^Y - \dim A_1^Y.$$

2) It remains to prove that

$$\dim B_{11}^Y - \dim A_1^Y = \dim N_3^Z - \dim N_2^Z. \tag{7.2}$$

To do so, we will count the X-orbits on good pairs and very good triples.

Let $r \in \{2, 3\}$. Suppose the good pairs (if $r = 2$), respectively the very good triples (if $r = 3$), $\{P^1, \dots, P^r\}$ and $\{Q^1, \dots, Q^r\}$ belong to the same X-orbit. Then, without loss we may assume that

$$P^i = \{R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}, P_1^i, \dots, P_s^i\},\ Q^i = \{R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}, Q_1^i, \dots, Q_s^i\} \tag{7.3}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Denote

$$\bar{P}^i := \{P_1^i, \dots, P_s^i\},\ \bar{Q}^i := \{Q_1^i, \dots, Q_s^i\}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq r$.

By assumption, there is some $\sigma \in \mathsf{S}_m$ sending $\{P^1, \dots, P^r\}$ to $\{Q^1, \dots, Q^r\}$. Let t be the number of common a-subsets that occur in all $P^1, \dots, P^r$. Then t is also the number of common a-subsets that occur in all $Q^1, \dots, Q^r$, and $t \geq b - s$.

Consider the case $t = b - s$. Then the t common a-subsets among all P^i are precisely $R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}$, and similarly, the t common a-subsets among all Q^i are precisely $R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}$. It follows that σ acts on the set $\{R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}\}$, and preserves the set

$$\cup_{j=1}^s P_j^i = \cup_{j=1}^s Q_j^i$$

which can be identified with Δ'. Now we can write $\sigma = \mu\tau$, where

$$\mu \in \mathsf{S}_{m-sa} = \mathrm{Sym}(\cup_{j=1}^{b-s} R_j)$$

acts on the set $\{R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}\}$, and $\tau \in Z = \mathrm{Sym}(\Delta')$ sends $\{\bar{P}^1, \dots, \bar{P}^r\}$ to $\{\bar{Q}^1, \dots, \bar{Q}^r\}$. Thus, the two pairs, respectively triples, $\{\bar{P}^1, \dots, \bar{P}^r\}$ and $\{\bar{Q}^1, \dots, \bar{Q}^r\}$ of partitions of Δ' belong to the same Z-orbit.

Next assume that $t > b - s$ and set $v = t + s - b$. Then the t common a-subsets among all P^i are precisely $R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}, S_1, \dots, S_v$, and similarly, the t common a-subsets among all Q^i are precisely $R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}, T_1, \dots, T_v$, for some a-subsets S_j and T_j of Δ. It follows that σ sends $\{R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}, S_1, \dots, S_v\}$ to $\{R_1, \dots, R_{b-s}, T_1, \dots, T_v\}$, and Σ to Θ, where

$$\Sigma = \Delta \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{b-s} R_j \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{v} S_j),\ \Theta = \Delta \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{b-s} R_j \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{v} T_j).$$

Set $R'_j := R_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq b - s$. Also set $R_{b-s+j} := S_j$ and $R'_{b-s+j} := T_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq v$. Then there is a permutation $\pi \in \mathsf{S}_t$ such that $\sigma(R_j) = R'_{\pi(j)}$. Now we can find $\gamma \in \mathsf{S}_m = \mathrm{Sym}(\Delta)$ such that

$$\gamma_\Sigma = 1_\Sigma,\ \gamma(R_j) = R_{\pi^{-1}(j)}.$$

Clearly, $\sigma\gamma$ sends R_j to R_j for $1 \le j \le b-s$ (and S_j to T_j), and sends $\{P^1, \dots, P^r\}$ to $\{Q^1, \dots, Q^r\}$. Now we can repeat the argument of the preceding case $t = b - s$ to show that the two pairs, respectively triples, $\{\bar{P}^1, \dots, \bar{P}^r\}$ and $\{\bar{Q}^1, \dots, \bar{Q}^r\}$ of partitions of Δ' belong to the same Z-orbit.

Conversely, it is obvious that if $\{\bar{P}^1, \dots, \bar{P}^r\}$ and $\{\bar{Q}^1, \dots, \bar{Q}^r\}$ belong to the same Z-orbit, then $\{P^1, \dots, P^r\}$ and $\{Q^1, \dots, Q^r\}$, defined as in (7.3), belong to the same Y-orbit. We have therefore proved that $\dim B_{11}^Y = \dim N_3^Z$ and $\dim A_1^Y = \dim N_2^Z$, whence (7.2) holds. □

Theorem 7.11. *Let $p = 2$ and n be even. Suppose that $n > m \ge 11$ and $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ embeds into A_n via its actions on subsets or partitions of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Then $f_2(X) \ge 3$ and $e_3(X) \ge h(X)+2$, unless A_m embeds into A_n via its action on 2-subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.*

Proof. 1) The inequality $e_2(X) \ge 2$, and hence $f_2(X) \ge 3$, is proved in Lemma 7.5.

If A_m embeds into A_n via its action of k-subsets of Δ with $2 < k < m/2$, then $h(X) \le 2$ by Lemma 7.2, and $e_3(X) \ge 4$ by Lemma 7.7. Thus $e_3(X) \ge h(X) + 2$ as stated.

2) From now on, we assume that A_m embeds in A_n via its action on partitions of Δ into b a-subsets, $a, b \ge 2$. By Lemma 7.2, either $h(X) \le 2$, or $h(X) = 3$ and $b = 2|(m/2)$.

Here we consider the case $a \ge 5$ and show that $e_3(X) \ge 5 \ge h(X) + 2$ in this case. Applying Lemma 7.10 with $s = 2$, we are reduced to prove that $\dim M_3^Y - \dim M_2^Y \ge 5$ for $b = 2$ and $Y = \mathsf{S}_m$. In this base case $b = 2$, each partition is a pair

$$[A] := \{A, \Delta \setminus A\}$$

with $|A| = a = |\Delta|/2$. Hence the Y-orbits on pairs of partitions $\{[A], [B]\}$ are labeled by $1 \le j \le t := \lfloor a/2 \rfloor$, where $|A \cap B| = a - j$. In particular, $\dim M_2^Y = t$.

So we need to produce at least $(t+5)$ Y-orbits on triples of partitions $\{[A], [B], [C]\} \in \Omega_3$. As in the proof of Lemma 7.7, we will label A, B, C so that

$$|A \cap B| \ge |A \cap C| \ge |B \cap C| \ge a/2 \tag{7.4}$$

and call $(|A \cap B|, |A \cap C|, |B \cap C|)$ the *mark* of the triple $\{A, B, C\}$. Certainly, triples with different marks belong to different S_m-orbits.

First let $|A \cap B| = a - 1$, so we may assume

$$A = \{1, 2, \dots, a-1, a\},\ B = \{1, 2, \dots, a-1, a+1\}.$$

For $1 \le j \le t$, by choosing

$$C = \{1, 2, \dots, a-j, a+2, a+3, \dots, a+j+1\}$$

we get a triple with the mark $(a-1, a-j, a-j)$. In fact, for $j = 1$, we have two choices for C:

$$\{1, 2, \dots, a-1, a+2\},\ \text{and } \{1, 2, \dots, a-2, a, a+1\}$$

which lead to two different S_m-orbits with mark $(a-1, a-1, a-1)$ for any $a \ge 4$ (since $|A \cap B \cap C| = a - 1$ for the first choice and $|A \cap B \cap C| = a - 2$ for the second choice). Similarly, for $1 \le j \le t-1$, by choosing

$$C = \{1, 2, \dots, a-j-1, a, a+2, a+3, \dots, a+j+1\}$$

we get a triple with the mark $(a-1, a-j, a-j-1)$.

Suppose in addition that $a \geq 6$. Then we choose

$$A = \{1, 2, \dots, a-2, a-1, a\},\ B = \{1, 2, \dots, a-2, a+1, a+2\}.$$

Taking

$$C = \{1, 2, \dots, a-2, a+3, a+4\} \text{ or } \{1, 2, \dots, a-3, a+3, a+4, a+5\}$$

we get triples with the mark $(a-2, a-2, a-2)$ and $(a-2, a-3, a-3)$. We have produced at least $(t+1)+(t-1)+2 \geq t+5$ orbits on triples, as desired.

Next assume that $a = 5$, and so $t = 2$. We have already produced 4 orbits with marks $(4, 4, 4)$ (two orbits), $(4, 4, 3)$, and $(4, 3, 3)$. We can also exhibits 3 more orbits with

$$\{A, B, C\} = \{12345, 12346, 12578\},\ \{12345, 12367, 12389\},\ \{12345, 12367, 12589\}$$

and mark $(4, 3, 2)$, $(3, 3, 3)$, and $(3, 3, 2)$, respectively. (Note that the last mark deviates from the convention (7.4), but it does not cause any problem since $a = 5$, as one can check.)

For the next part of the proof, we also consider the case $a = 4$, and so $s = 2$. We have already produced 4 orbits with marks $(3, 3, 3)$ (two orbits), $(3, 3, 2)$, and $(3, 2, 2)$. Next, the triples with

$$\{P, Q, R\} = \{1234, 1256, 3456\} \text{ and } \{1234, 1256, 1357\}$$

have the same mark $(2, 2, 2)$, but belong to different orbits. (Indeed, the former satisfies the identity $R = P + Q$, but for the latter no member of $[R]$ can be the sum of a member of $[P]$ with a member of $[R]$.) Thus we get at least 6 orbits on triples of partitions. (One can show by [GAP] that the number of orbits on triples is indeed 6 for both A_m and S_m.)

3) It remains to consider the case $2 \leq a \leq 4$. Since $m \geq 11$, we must have that $b \geq 3$, and so $h \leq 2$ by Lemma 7.2. For $a = 2$, 3, or 4, we set $s = 5$, 3, or 2, respectively. Applying Lemma 7.10, we are reduced to prove that $e' := \dim M_3^Y - \dim M_2^Y \geq 4$ for $b = s$ and $Y = \mathsf{S}_{sa}$. This has been done in 2) for $(a, s) = (4, 2)$. Using (6.3) and [GAP], one can check that $e' = 35$ for $(a, s) = (3, 3)$. Finally, assume that $(a, s) = (2, 5)$. Using (6.3) and [GAP], we see that the number of A_{10}-orbits on 2-subsets, respectively on 3-subsets of $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, 945\}$ is 6, respectively 139. Since A_{10} has index 2 in $Y = \mathsf{S}_{10}$, it follows that $\dim M_2^Y \leq 6$ and $\dim M_3^Y \geq 139/2$, whence $e' \geq 64$. □

Now we can prove the main result concerning the special embeddings of A_m into A_n:

Theorem 7.12. *Let $X = \mathsf{A}_m$ be embedded in A_n via its actions on partitions or on k-subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ with $2 \leq k < m/2$, and $11 \leq m < n$. Let $p = 2$ and let V be any $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension greater than 1. Then $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is reducible.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that V is irreducible over X. By Lemma 7.1, $n \geq m(m-1)/2$. Since $m \geq 11$, we have

$$|X| = \frac{m!}{2} < 2^{\frac{m(m-1)-12}{4}} \leq (2^{\frac{n-6}{4}})^2.$$

The irreducibility of V on X forces that $\dim V < \sqrt{|X|} < 2^{(n-6)/4}$. This bound implies by Proposition 4.1 that V extends to S_n. Thus, without loss we may assume that V is

an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module. Also, since $2^{(n-6)/4} < 2^{\lfloor (n-2)/2 \rfloor}$, V cannot be a basic spin module.

Now if n is odd, then the X-module V is reducible by [KS1, Theorem 3.10]. Hence $2|n$, and V satisfies the conclusion (i) of Theorem 3.2. By Corollary 7.4, X does *not* embed into A_n via its action on 2-subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Hence, by Theorem 7.11, $f_2(X) \geq 3$ and $e_3(X) \geq h(X) + 2$. Clearly, X is a perfect subgroup and $f_1(X) = 1$. Therefore, the X-module V is reducible by Theorem 6.5, a contradiction. □

8. General embeddings of A_m into A_n

Throughout this section, $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ is a subgroup of A_n, with $n > m \geq 5$. Recall the notation $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\Delta = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.

First, we deal with the small cases $5 \leq m \leq 10$:

Lemma 8.1. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a transitive subgroup of A_n with $n > m$ and $5 \leq m \leq 10$, V be an $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension > 1 such that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is irreducible. Then $(m, n) = (5, 6)$, $(6, 10)$, $(7, 15)$, or $(8, 15)$.*

Proof. 1) First we consider the case where V is not the heart of the natural permutation module of $Y := \mathsf{A}_n$. Suppose for instance that $m = 10$. The assumptions that X is a transitive subgroup of Y and $n > m$ imply by [Atl] that $n \geq 45$. This in turn implies by [GT1, Lemma 6.1] that $\dim V \geq (n^2 - 5n + 2)/2 = 901 > 567 \geq b_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$, where $b_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ denotes the largest degree of irreducible $\mathbb{F}X$-representations. It follows that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is reducible. The same arguments apply to the case $m = 9$, where we have $n \geq 36$ and $b_{\mathbb{F}}(X) \leq 216$.

Suppose now that $m = 8$. According to [Atl] and [JLPW], $n = 15$ or $n \geq 28$; furthermore, $b_{\mathbb{F}}(X) \leq 70$. As above, $\dim V > b_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ if $n \geq 28$. It follows that $n = 15$. The same arguments apply to the case $5 \leq m \leq 7$. (In fact, one can show that we must have either $(m, n) = (5, 6)$ or $(m, n, p, \dim V) = (8, 15, 2, 64)$.)

2) Now we may assume that V is the heart of the natural permutation module $\mathbb{F}\Omega$ of Y. By the assumption, X acts transitively on Ω. If this action is not doubly transitive, then the restriction of the permutation character of $\mathbb{C}\Omega$ is $1_X + \alpha + \beta$ where α, β are (not necessarily irreducible) X-characters of degree > 1. Since the Brauer character of $\mathbb{F}\Omega$ is $\varphi + e \cdot 1_Y$ with $e \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}_p(Y)$, it follows that V is reducible over X. Thus X acts doubly transitively on Ω. Now we can read off the possible value of n using [Atl]. □

Remark 8.2. The special cases (m, n) listed in the statement of Lemma 8.1 are indeed exceptional. For these pairs, we can embed A_m into A_n so that A_m acts doubly transitively on Ω. Take V to be the heart of the permutation module $\mathbb{C}\Omega$. It is well known that any doubly transitive group is irreducible on V. This is also almost always true for $p > 0$ — see [Mo].

We will need the following group-theoretic result:

Lemma 8.3. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a transitive subgroup of A_n with $n > m \geq 11$. Then $n \geq m(m-1)/2$ and X cannot act doubly transitively on Ω. If X is imprimitive, then $n \geq m(m-1)$. If X is primitive, then one of the following statements holds:*

(i) *X acts on Ω via its action on k-subsets of Δ with $2 \le k < m/2$ or on partitions of Δ, and $n \ge m(m-1)/2$.*
(ii) *$n > |X|^{3/10} > m(m-1)$.*

Proof. From the classification of doubly transitive permutation representations of A_m [Ma] and the assumption $m \ge 11$, it follows that A_m has no doubly transitive permutation representation of degree $n > m$. Next, consider the transitive action of X on Ω and let X_1 be a point stabilizer of this action. Then $[X : X_1] = n > m$. We can find a maximal subgroup M of X containing X_1.

Now we consider the action of M on Δ. If this action is intransitive, then by maximality of M, M is the stabilizer in X of a k-subset of Δ for some $1 \le k < m/2$. On the other hand, if this action is transitive but imprimitive, then M is the stabilizer in X of a partition of Δ into b a-subsets, with $a, b \ge 2$ and $ab = m$. By Lemma 7.1, in either case we have $n \ge [X : M] \ge m(m-1)/2$ (whence $[X : X_1] \ge m(m-1)$ if X is imprimitive), unless M is intransitive and $k = 1$. In this exceptional case, $M = \mathsf{A}_{m-1}$ and $[X : X_1] = n > m = [X : M]$. Thus X_1 is a proper subgroup of M, and so, as is well known, $[M : X_1] \ge m - 1$ and $n \ge m(m-1)$.

Suppose now that M acts primitively on Δ. By Bochert's Theorem 14.2 of [Wie], $[\mathsf{S}_m : M] \ge \lfloor (m+1)/2 \rfloor !$. Since $m \ge 11$, we have $\frac{\lfloor (m+1)/2 \rfloor !}{2} > \left(\frac{m!}{2}\right)^{3/10}$. Therefore $n \ge [X : M] > |X|^{3/10} > m(m-1)$ as $m \ge 11$.

We have proved the bound $n \ge m(m-1)/2$ and also that $n \ge m(m-1)$ if X is imprimitive. Assume now that X is primitive. Then $X_1 = M$, and the above analysis yields the final claim of the lemma. □

Theorem 8.4. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a primitive subgroup of A_n with $n > m \ge 9$. Let $p = 2$ and let V be an $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension > 1. Then the restriction $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is reducible.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.1, we may assume that $m \ge 11$. Assume for a contradiction that V is irreducible over X. We apply Lemma 8.3. In the case (i) of Lemma 8.3 we are done by Theorem 7.12.

Now suppose that the case (ii) of Lemma 8.3 holds. Then $|X| < n^{10/3}$ and $n \ge 155$ as $m \ge 11$. Since V is irreducible over X, we must have that

$$\dim V < n^{5/3} < \frac{1}{2}(n-1)(n-2).$$

In particular, $\dim V < 2^{(n-6)/4}$ (as $n \ge 155$), whence V extends to S_n by Proposition 4.1. We denote the (unique up to isomorphism) extension of V to S_n by the same letter V.

By Lemma 8.3, the action of $X = \mathsf{A}_m$ on Ω is not doubly transitive. Hence, if n is odd then, we are done by appealing to [KS1, Theorem 3.10]. Assume that $2|n \ge 155$. Then the condition $1 < \dim V < (n-1)(n-2)/2$ for the irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module V implies by [J3, Theorem 7] that $V \cong D^{(n-k,k)}$ with $k = 1$ or 2. As before, let $1 + \alpha$ denote the (complex) permutation character of S_n on Ω.

Suppose $k = 1$. Then $V = D^{(n-1,1)}$ is irreducible over X. Denoting by α^0 the restriction of α to $2'$-elements in S_n, we see that the Brauer character of V is $\alpha^0 - 1$. Furthermore, X is perfect and $[\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X \alpha, 1_X]_X = 0$ by transitivity of X on Ω. Hence the

irreducibility of V over X forces that α is also irreducible over X. In other words, X acts doubly transitively on Ω, a contradiction.

Assume now that $k = 2$. Then $\wedge^2(D^{(n-1,1)})$ has a composition series with composition factors V (once), and $\mathbf{1}$ (once if $4|n$ and twice if $n \equiv 2 \pmod 4$). The same is true for $\wedge^2(D^{(n-1,1)})$ considered as an X-module. Suppose in addition that $D^{(n-1,1)}$ is reducible over X. Then we can write the Brauer character of the $\mathbb{F}X$-module $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_X D^{(n-1,1)}$ as $\beta + \gamma$, where β and γ are Brauer characters of X, $\beta(1) \geq 1$ and $\gamma(1) \geq 3$. Note that

$$\wedge^2(\beta + \gamma) = \wedge^2(\beta) + \wedge^2(\gamma) + \beta\gamma.$$

It follows that the Brauer character of the X-module $\wedge^2(D^{(n-1,1)})$ is the sum of three Brauer characters, with at least two of degree ≥ 3. This contradicts the aforementioned composition structure of the X-module $\wedge^2(D^{(n-1,1)})$. Thus $D^{(n-1,1)}$ is irreducible over X. But then, arguing as in the previous paragraph, we again arrive at the contradiction that X acts doubly transitively on Ω. □

The case $p \neq 2$ can be done using results of [KS1], [KS2] and Proposition 4.3:

Proposition 8.5. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a transitive subgroup of A_n with $n > m \geq 9$. Let $p \neq 2$ and V be an $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension > 1. Then $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is reducible.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.1, we may assume that $m \geq 11$. Assume for a contradiction that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is irreducible. By Lemma 8.3, X is not doubly transitive, and $n \geq m(m-1)/2$. If V is extendible to S_n, we can apply [KS1, Main Theorem] to get a contradiction. Suppose V is not extendible to S_n. If $p \neq 3$, we again arrive at a contradiction by using [KS2, Main Theorem]. So we may assume that $p = 3$. By Proposition 4.3(ii) we have that

$$\dim V \geq 2^{\frac{n-8}{4}} \geq 2^{\frac{m^2-m-16}{8}} =: c_m.$$

Now, if $m \geq 12$ then $c_m > \sqrt{m!/2} = \sqrt{|X|}$. If $m = 11$, then $c_m > 3444$ whereas the largest degree of complex irreducible representations of $X = \mathsf{A}_{11}$ is 2310. In either case, X cannot be irreducible on V. □

Now Theorem 1.2 follows immediately from Theorem 8.4 and Proposition 8.5.

Note that for $p \neq 2$, Proposition 8.5 shows that any proper transitive subgroup $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ of A_n acts reducibly on all non-trivial modules over $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$ (provided $m \geq 9$). For $p = 2$, if X is primitive, the same result holds by Theorem 8.4. Now we handle imprimitive embeddings of A_m into A_n for $p = 2$. Here our result is a little weaker:

Proposition 8.6. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a (transitive) imprimitive subgroup of A_n with $n > m \geq 9$. Let $p = 2$ and let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension > 1. Then the X-module $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ cannot be primitive irreducible.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.1, we may assume that $m \geq 11$. Assume for a contradiction V is irreducible and primitive over X. Consider the action of X as a subgroup of A_n on Ω and let X_1 be a point stabilizer. Since X is imprimitive, there is a maximal subgroup $M > X_1$ of X. Now $b := [X : M] \geq m \geq 11$, and we may assume that $X < Y := (\mathsf{S}_a \wr \mathsf{S}_b) \cap \mathsf{A}_n$ for $a := n/b > 1$. By Lemma 8.3, $n \geq m(m-1)$. If $a = 2$ or 4, then $O_2(Y) > 1$, and so V cannot be irreducible over $Y > X$, a contradiction. So we have $a \geq 3$ and $a \neq 4$.

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ be a 2-regular partition of n such that V is a simple submodule of $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n} D^\lambda$. Observe that $m! < (m/2)^m$ for $m \geq 6$. Since $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is irreducible, by [GLT, Theorem 5.1] we have

$$2^{\frac{n-\lambda_1}{2}-1} \leq \dim V \leq \sqrt{|\mathsf{A}_m|} < \sqrt{\frac{m^m}{2^{m+1}}},$$

whence $n - \lambda_1 < m \log_2 m - m + 1$. This in turn implies that $2\lambda_1 - n \geq n/m$. Indeed, otherwise we would have $\lambda_1 < n/2 + n/2m$ and so

$$n - \lambda_1 > \frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2m} = n \cdot \frac{m-1}{2m} \geq \frac{(m-1)^2}{2} > m \log_2 m - m + 1,$$

a contradiction.

We have shown that $2\lambda_1 - n \geq n/m \geq n/b = a \geq 3$. Also, $n - \lambda_1 \geq 1$ since $\dim V > 1$. Applying Proposition 4.2, we see that the restriction of D^λ to a natural subgroup S_a of S_n affords both $\mathbf{1}$ and $D^{(a-1,1)}$ as composition factors. If $a \geq 5$, then $\dim D^{(a-1,1)} \geq 4$ and so any irreducible summand of the A_a-module $D^{(a-1,1)}$ has dimension ≥ 2 (in fact $D^{(a-1,1)}$ is irreducible over A_a). On the other hand, if $a = 3$, then $D^{(a-1,1)}$ splits into a direct sum of two non-trivial irreducible A_a-submodules. Thus $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_a} V$ affords both the trivial module and also another non-trivial irreducible module as composition factors. It follows that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_Z V$ cannot be homogeneous for $Z := \mathsf{A}_a \times \ldots \times \mathsf{A}_a = (\mathsf{A}_a)^b \lhd Y$. But this is a contradiction, as $Z \lhd Y$ and the Y-module V is primitive. □

The following lemma deals with tensor indecomposable irreducible representations of A_m. These were studied extensively in [Z, BeK1, BeK2, GoK, GrJ, BeK3].

Lemma 8.7. *Let $X \cong \mathsf{A}_m$ be a subgroup of A_n with $n \geq m \geq 5$. Let V be an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module of dimension > 1. Assume that the X-module $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is irreducible and tensor indecomposable. Then one of the following holds:*

(i) *X is a transitive subgroup of A_n.*
(ii) *There is some $t \in \{1, 2\}$ such that X fixes t points and acts transitively on $n - t$ remaining points of Ω. Furthermore, V is irreducible over a natural subgroup A_{n-t} of A_n.*

Proof. Suppose that X acts intransitively on Ω. Each non-trivial orbit of X has at least $m \geq 5$ points. If X has at least two non-trivial orbits on X, then we may assume that there is some $5 \leq k \leq n/2$ such that X acts non-trivially on both $\Omega^{(1)} := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $\Omega^{(2)} := \{k+1, \dots, n\}$. These actions induce embeddings $\pi_i : X \to \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega^{(i)})$, namely, $g \in X$ acts on $\Omega^{(i)}$ as $\pi_i(g)$. Now, $X < Y := \mathsf{A}_k \times \mathsf{A}_{n-k}$ and $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_Y V$ is irreducible. Hence $V|_Y \cong V_1 \boxtimes V_2$ is an outer tensor product of irreducible modules V_1 over A_k and V_2 over A_{m-k}. Note that $\dim V_1 > 1$, as otherwise the 3-cycles in A_k would act trivially on V. Similarly $\dim V_2 > 1$. It follows that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V = U_1 \otimes U_2$, where $U_i \cong \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_{k_i}}_{\pi_i(X)} V_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $(k_1, k_2) := (k, n-k)$. In particular, $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_X V$ is tensor decomposable, contrary to the assumption.

Thus X has only one non-trivial orbit on Ω, say of length $n - t$ for some $t > 0$, and X fixes the remaining t points. Furthermore, $t \leq 2$, as otherwise X is centralized by a 3-cycle and so cannot act irreducibly on V. □

Finally, in connection with Lemma 8.7, we bound the number of extensions of irreducible representations of A_{n-1} to A_n. For this type of question, it is convenient to use the following simple observation:

Lemma 8.8. *Let Y be a subgroup of X and U be a finite-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{F}$. Let $\Psi : Y \to GL(U)$ be an irreducible representation. Suppose that $\Phi_i : X \to GL(U)$, $i = 1, 2$, are two isomorphic representations of X with $\mathrm{Res}^X_Y(\Phi_i) = \Psi$. Then in fact $\Phi_1 = \Phi_2$.*

Proof. Fix a basis of the vector space U and write Ψ and Φ_i as matrix representations wit respect to this basis. By the assumption, there is some invertible matrix A such that $\Phi_2(x) = A\Phi_1(x)A^{-1}$ for all $x \in X$. Since both Φ_i extend Ψ, we have that $\Psi(y) = A\Psi(y)A^{-1}$ for all $y \in Y$. By Schur's lemma, A is scalar, and so $\Phi_2 = \Phi_1$. □

Now we deal with the aforementioned question for symmetric groups:

Lemma 8.9. *Assume $n \geq 3$ and fix a natural embedding of S_{n-1} into S_n. Then every irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_{n-1}$-representation $\mathsf{S}_{n-1} \to GL(U)$ has at most one extension to S_n.*

Proof. Consider U as an $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_{n-1}$-module, and suppose that there are two distinct p-regular partitions $\lambda, \mu \vdash n$ such that

$$\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(D^\lambda) \cong \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(D^\mu) \cong U.$$

Since $\mathrm{soc}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(D^\lambda)) \cong \mathrm{soc}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(D^\mu))$, by [K3, Corollary 5.3], precisely one of the modules $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(D^\lambda)$, $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(D^\mu)$ is reducible, a contradiction. Now apply Lemma 8.8. □

Proposition 8.10. *Assume $n \geq 5$ and fix a natural embedding of A_{n-1} into A_n. Then every irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_{n-1}$-representation $\mathsf{A}_{n-1} \to GL(U)$ has at most three distinct extensions to A_n.*

Proof. We assume that U extends to an $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{A}_n$-module V_1 and find all possible other extensions V_2 of U to A_n. Consider A_{n-1} as the derived subgroup of a natural subgroup S_{n-1} of S_n. By Lemma 8.8, it suffices to bound the number of extensions up to isomorphism. For each $i = 1, 2$, we can find an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_n$-module W_i such that $V_i \hookrightarrow \mathrm{soc}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n}(W_i))$, and an irreducible $\mathbb{F}\mathsf{S}_{n-1}$-module T such that $U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{soc}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(T))$. We also fix a transposition $g \in \mathsf{S}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{A}_{n-1}$, and distinguish the following cases.

Case I: U is not S_{n-1}-invariant. Then for $i = 1, 2$ we have that

$$\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(V_i^g) = U^g \ncong U = \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(V_i),$$

and so V_i is not S_n-invariant. Hence $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n}(W_i) \cong V_i \oplus V_i^g$, and similarly $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(T) \cong U \oplus U^g$. Now $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(W_i) \cong U \oplus U^g \cong \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(T)$. It follows that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_1) \cong T \cong \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_2)$. By Lemma 8.9, $W_1 \cong W_2$, whence V_2 is isomorphic to V_1 or V_1^g. Since $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(V_1^g) = U^g \ncong U$, we must have that $V_2 \cong V_1$.

Case IIa: U is S_{n-1}-invariant and both V_1, V_2 are S_n-invariant. In particular, we have $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n}(W_i) = V_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and similarly $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(T) = U$. Now if $p = 2$, then the

Brauer character of any extension of U to S_{n-1} is uniquely determined by its restriction to A_{n-1} which is the Brauer character of U. Thus U has a unique extension to S_{n-1}, and so $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_1) \cong \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_2)$. It follows by Lemma 8.9 that $W_1 \cong W_2$ and so $V_1 \cong V_2$.

Next suppose that $p \neq 2$. Then U has two distinct extensions T and T^g to S_{n-1} and V_i has two distinct extensions W_i and W_i^g to S_n. It follows that $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_i) \in \{T, T^g\}$ and so $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_2) \in \{\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_1), \mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_1^g)\}$. By Lemma 8.9, $W_2 \cong W_1$ or W_1^g, and so $V_2 \cong V_1$.

Thus Case IIa shows that among the extensions of U to A_n, at most one of them is S_n-invariant.

Case IIb: U is S_{n-1}-invariant, but neither V_1 nor V_2 is S_n-invariant. In this case for $i = 1, 2$ we have that $W_i = \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n}(V_i)$, and so

$$\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_i) \cong \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{A}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(V_i)) \cong \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}_{\mathsf{A}_{n-1}}(U)$$

is reducible. Also, $\mathrm{soc}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_1)) \cong \mathrm{soc}(\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_2))$. If moreover $W_1 \ncong W_2$, then the latter implies by [K3, Corollary 5.3] that (precisely) one of the modules $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{S}_{n-1}}(W_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, is irreducible, a contradiction. It follows that $W_1 \cong W_2$ and so $V_2 \in \{V_1, V_1^g\}$ since $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathsf{S}_n}_{\mathsf{A}_n}(W_1) = V_1 \oplus V_1^g$.

Thus Case IIb shows that among the extensions of U to A_n, at most two of them can be non-S_n-invariant. Hence in the case where U is S_{n-1}-invariant, there are at most three extensions to A_n. □

9. Rank 3 permutation groups

To illustrate applicability of Theorem 6.5 to other primitive subgroups of S_n, in this section we consider finite simple classical groups X acting as rank 3 permutation groups on Ω, where (Ω, X) is one of the following:

(i) Ω is the set of 2-dimensional subspaces of $W = \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $X = PSL(W) = PSL_d(q)$ with $d \geq 4$;
(ii) Ω is the set of singular 1-dimensional subspaces of $W = \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $X = PSp(W)' = PSp_d(q)'$ with $2|d \geq 4$ (note that $Sp_d(q)' \neq Sp_d(q)$ only when $(d, q) = (4, 2)$);
(iii) Ω is the set of singular 1-dimensional subspaces of $W = \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $X = P\Omega(W) = P\Omega_d^{\pm}(q)$ with $d \geq 5$;
(iv) Ω is the set of singular 1-dimensional subspaces of $W = \mathbb{F}_{q^2}^d$ and $X = PSU(W) = PSU_d(q)$ with $d \geq 4$.

According to the main result of [KaL], these families account for all the standard rank 3 permutation representations of finite simple classical groups.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $X < \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) = \mathsf{S}_n$, where (Ω, X) is as listed above, and $2|n$.*

(i) *Assume furthermore that $d \geq 6$ when $X = PSp_d(q)$ or $X = PSU_d(q)$, and $d \geq 7$ when $X = P\Omega_d^{\pm}(q)$. Then $f_3(X) \geq 6$.*
(ii) *Also, $f_3(X) \geq 5$ if $X = PSp_4(q)$, $PSU_4(q)$, $PSU_5(q)$, $\Omega_5(q)$, or $P\Omega_6^{\pm}(q)$.*

Proof. (a) First we consider the case $X = PSL(W)$ with $W = \langle e_1, \dots, e_d\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ of dimension $d \geq 4$. Then X has at least six orbits on Ω_3, with the following representatives:

• $A = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $B = \langle e_1, e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $C = \langle e_2, e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ (note that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A+B+C) = 3$ and $A \cap B \cap C = 0$ here);

• $A = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $B = \langle e_1, e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $C = \langle e_1, e_2 + e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ (here, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A+B+C) = 3$ and $A \cap B \cap C \neq 0$);

• $A = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $B = \langle e_3, e_4\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $C = \langle e_1 + e_3, e_2 + e_4\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ (here, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A+B+C) = 4$ and $\{\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap B), \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap C), \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(B \cap C) = \{0, 0, 0\}$);

• $A = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $B = \langle e_1, e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $C = \langle e_2 + e_3, e_4\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ (here, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A+B+C) = 4$ and $\{\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap B), \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap C), \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(B \cap C) = \{1, 0, 0\}$);

• $A = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $B = \langle e_1, e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $C = \langle e_2, e_4\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ (here, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A+B+C) = 4$ and $\{\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap B), \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap C), \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(B \cap C) = \{1, 1, 0\}$);

• $A = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $B = \langle e_1, e_3\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, $C = \langle e_1, e_4\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ (here, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A+B+C) = 4$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A \cap B \cap C) = 1$).

(b) In the remaining cases of (i), the assumption on d implies that W contains a non-degenerate 6-dimensional subspace with hyperbolic (Witt) basis $(e_1, e_2, e_3, f_1, f_2, f_3)$. Also, since $n = |\Omega|$ is even, q is odd. We will write any element in Ω as $\langle a\rangle$, the 1-space generated by a vector $a \in W$. In the Ω-case, for any unordered triple $\pi = \{A, B, C\}$, with $A = \langle a\rangle$, $B = \langle b\rangle$, $C = \langle c\rangle \in \Omega$ and $\dim(A+B+C) = 3$, we can associate to it the Gram matrix Γ of the bilinear form $(\cdot, \cdot)$ written in the basis (a, b, c). Since changing to another basis of $A+B+C$ changes $\det(\Gamma)$ by a factor which belongs to the subgroup $F_0 := \mathbb{F}_q^{\times 2}$ of $F := \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$, we can associate to such π a canonical element $\delta := \det(\Gamma)F_0 \in F/F_0$. Then the following unordered triples $\{A, B, C\} \in \Omega_3$ belong to disjoint X-orbits:

• $A = \langle e_1\rangle$, $B = \langle e_2\rangle$, $C = \langle e_1 + e_2\rangle$ (note that $A+B+C$ is a 2-dimensional totally singular subspace here);

• In the Sp/SU-case: $A = \langle e_1\rangle$, $B = \langle f_1\rangle$, $C = \langle e_1 + \lambda f_1\rangle$, where $\lambda = 1$ in the Sp-case and $\lambda^{q-1} = -1$ in the SU-case. Note that $A+B+C$ is a 2-dimensional non-degenerate subspace here;

• $A = \langle e_1\rangle$, $B = \langle e_2\rangle$, $C = \langle e_3\rangle$ (here, $A+B+C$ is a 3-dimensional totally singular subspace);

• $A = \langle e_1\rangle$, $B = \langle f_1\rangle$, $C = \langle e_2\rangle$. Note that $U := A+B+C$ is a 3-dimensional subspace with $C = \mathrm{rad}(U)$;

• $A = \langle e_1\rangle$, $B = \langle f_1\rangle$, $C = \langle e_1 + e_2\rangle$. Note that $U := A+B+C$ is a 3-dimensional subspace with $\dim \mathrm{rad}(U) = 1$ but $A, B, C \neq \mathrm{rad}(U)$. In fact, in the Sp-case, we get one more triple with the same A, B, but with $C' = \langle e_1 + f_1 + e_2\rangle$ – note that $A \perp C$, but no two of A, B, C' are orthogonal to each other;

• In the Ω/SU-case: $A = \langle e_1\rangle$, $B = \langle f_1\rangle$, $C = \langle e_2 + \lambda f_2 + e_1 - \lambda f_1\rangle$, where $\lambda \in F$ in the Ω-case and $\lambda = 1$ in the SU-case. Here, $W := A+B+C$ is a 3-dimensional non-degenerate subspace. Furthermore, in the Ω-case, we have $\delta = -2\lambda F_0$, whence we can choose λ so that $\delta = F_0$, respectively $\delta \neq F_0$.

(c) Ignoring the vectors e_3, f_3, the arguments in (b) also show that $f_2(X) \geq 5$ if $X = PSp_4(q)$, $PSU_4(q)$, $PSU_5(q)$, $\Omega_5(q)$, or $\Omega_6^{\pm}(q)$. □

Lemma 9.2. *Let $X < \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) = \mathsf{S}_n$, where (Ω, X) is as listed above, that is, $d \geq 4$ when $X = PSL_d(q)$, $PSU_d(q)$, or $PSp_d(q)$, and $d \geq 5$ when $X = P\Omega_d^{\pm}(q)$. Suppose that $p = 2|n$. Then $h(X) \leq 3$ if $X = P\Omega_d^+(q)$ with $4|d \geq 8$, and $h(X) \leq 2$ otherwise.*

Proof. As mentioned in the proof of Lemma 9.1, $2|n$ implies that q is odd. We follow the proof of Lemma 7.2 and its notation. First, $\dim H^2(X, \mathbb{F})$, which is the 2-rank of the Schur multiplier of X, is ≤ 2 if $X = P\Omega_d^+(q)$ with $4|d \geq 8$, and ≤ 1 otherwise by [KlL, Theorem 5.1.4]. Hence it suffices to show that

$$\dim \mathrm{Hom}(X_1, (\mathbb{F}, +)) \leq 1, \tag{9.1}$$

where X_1 is the point stabilizer in X of a point in Ω. Without loss we may replace X by its central cover $SL_d(q)$, $SU_d(q)$, $Sp_d(q)$, or $\Omega_d^{\pm}(q)$. We also fix a basis $(e_1, \dots, e_d)$ of the natural module W of X.

Consider the case $X = SL_d(q)$. Then $X_1 = \mathrm{Stab}_X(\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle) = Q \rtimes Y$, where $|Q|$ is a q-power and $Y = (SL_2(q) \times SL_{d-2}(q)) \rtimes C_{q-1}$. Since q is odd, we have that $O^2(Q) = Q$ and $O^2(SL_e(q)) = SL_e(q)$ for any $e \geq 2$. Hence (9.1) follows.

From now on we may assume $X \neq SL_d(q)$. We can then choose e_1 to be singular and let $X_1 = \mathrm{Stab}_X(\langle e_1 \rangle)$.

Let $X = SU_d(q)$. Then $X_1 = Q \rtimes Y$, where $|Q|$ is a q-power and $Y = SU_{d-2}(q) \rtimes C_{q^2-1}$. As $d \geq 4$ and q is odd, we see that $O^2(SU_{d-2}(q)) = SU_{d-2}(q)$, and so (9.1) follows.

Suppose $X = Sp_d(q)$. Then $X_1 = Q \rtimes Y$, where $|Q|$ is a q-power and $Y = Sp_{d-2}(q) \rtimes C_{q-1}$. As $d \geq 4$ and q is odd, we see that $O^2(Sp_{d-2}(q)) = Sp_{d-2}(q)$, yielding (9.1).

Suppose $X = \Omega_d^{\epsilon}(q)$. Then $X_1 = Q \rtimes Y$, where $|Q|$ is a q-power and $Y = \Omega_{d-2}^{\epsilon}(q) \rtimes C_{q-1}$. As $d \geq 5$ and q is odd, we see that $O^2(\Omega_{d-2}^{\epsilon}(q)) = \Omega_{d-2}^{\epsilon}(q)$, and so we are done. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Assume the contrary: $\mathrm{Res}_X^{\mathsf{A}_n} V$ is irreducible; in particular, V is irreducible. Note that X is not 2-transitive on Ω. Hence, by the main results of [KS1, KS2] we must have that $p = 2$ or 3.

(i) In the case $X = PSp_4(2)' \cong \mathsf{A}_6$, we have $n = 15$, and so $\dim V \geq 13$ (see [Dec]), whereas the largest dimension $\mathfrak{b}(X)$ of irreducible $\mathbb{F}X$-modules is at most 10, cf. [JLPW]. Thus V is reducible over X. Next, in the cases $X = SU_4(2) \cong PSp_4(3)$, respectively $SL_4(2)$, $Sp_6(2)$, we have $n \geq 27$, 35, 63, and $\mathfrak{b}(X) \leq 81$, 70, 512, respectively, according to [JLPW]. Certainly, $\mathrm{Res}_X^{\mathsf{A}_n} V$ is reducible if $\dim V > \mathfrak{b}(X)$. So we must have that $\dim V \leq \mathfrak{b}(X)$. Since $\mathfrak{b}(X) < (n^2 - 5n + 2)/2$, by [GT1, Lemma 6.1] we see that $V \cong D^{(n-1,1)}$ is isomorphic to the heart of the natural permutation module $\mathbb{F}\Omega$. As in the proof of Lemma 8.1, we conclude that X is 2-transitive on Ω, a contradiction.

(ii) We may now assume that X is not isomorphic to any of the groups considered in (i). Direct computation shows that $2^{(n-8)/4} > |X|^{1/2}$. Since $\mathrm{Res}_X^{\mathsf{A}_n} V$ is irreducible, we must have that

$$\dim(V) < 2^{(n-8)/4}, \tag{9.2}$$

which implies by Propositions 4.1 and 4.3 that V extends to S_n. Applying the Main Theorem and Theorem 3.10 of [KS1], we again arrive at the contradiction that X is 2-transitive in the case $p = 3$, as well as in the case $p = 2 \nmid n$.

Thus we have shown that $p = 2|n$. The upper bound (9.2) implies by Theorem 3.2 that $d_3(V) > d_1(V)$. Also, $f_1(X) = 1$, $f_2(X) = 2$ by Lemma 6.3, and $e_3(X) \geq h(X) + 1$ by Lemmas 9.1 and 9.2. Now we can apply Theorem 6.5. □

Non-standard rank 3 permutation representations of finite classical groups, as well as other primitive subgroups of A_n, will be considered elsewhere.

References

[A] M. Aschbacher, On the maximal subgroups of the finite classical groups, *Invent. Math.* **76** (1984), 469–514.

[AS] M. Aschbacher and L. Scott, Maximal subgroups of finite groups, *J. Algebra* **92** (1985), 44–80.

[BaK] A. Baranov and A. S. Kleshchev, Maximal ideals in modular group algebras of the finitary symmetric and alternating groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **351** (1999), 595–617.

[Ben] D. Benson, Spin modules for symmetric groups, *J. London Math. Soc.* **38** (1988), 250–262.

[BeK1] C. Bessenrodt and A. Kleshchev, On Kronecker products of complex representations of the symmetric and alternating groups, *Pacific J. Math.* **190** (1999), 201–223.

[BeK2] C. Bessenrodt and A. Kleshchev, On tensor products of modular representations of symmetric groups, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **32** (2000), 292–296.

[BeK3] C. Bessenrodt and A. Kleshchev, Irreducible tensor products over alternating groups, *J. Algebra* **228** (2000), 536–550.

[BeO] C. Bessenrodt and J. Olsson, On residue symbols and the Mullineux conjecture, *J. Alg. Comb.* **7** (1998), 227–251.

[BK] J. Brundan and A.S. Kleshchev, Representations of the symmetric group which are irreducible over subgroups, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **530** (2001), 145–190.

[Atl] J.H. Conway, R.T. Curtis, S.P. Norton, R.A. Parker, and R.A. Wilson, '*An ATLAS of Finite Groups*', Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985.

[Dec] Decomposition matrices, http://www.math.rwth-aachen.de/homes/MOC/decomposition/

[FK] B. Ford and A.S. Kleshchev, A proof of the Mullineux conjecture, *Math. Z.* **226** (1997), 267–308.

[GAP] The GAP group, '**GAP** - *Groups, Algorithms, and Programming*', Version 4.4, 2004, `http://www.gap-system.org`.

[GoK] R. Gow and A. Kleshchev, Connections between the representations of the symmetric group and the symplectic group in characteristic 2, *J. Algebra* **221** (1999), 60–89.

[GrJ] J. Graham and G. James, On a conjecture of Gow and Kleshchev concerning tensor products, *J. Algebra* **227** (2000), 767–782.

[GLT] R.M. Guralnick, M. Larsen, and Pham Huu Tiep, Representation growth in positive characteristic and conjugacy classes of maximal subgroups, *Duke Math. J.* **161** (2012), 107–137.

[GT1] R.M. Guralnick and Pham Huu Tiep, The non-coprime $k(GV)$ problem, *J. Algebra* **293** (2005), 185–242.

[GT2] R.M. Guralnick and Pham Huu Tiep, A problem of Kollár and Larsen on finite linear groups and crepant resolutions, *J. Europ. Math. Soc.* **14** (2012), 605–657.

[J1] G.D. James, Representations of the symmetric group over the field of order 2, *J. Algebra* **38** (1976), 280–308.

[J2] G.D. James, '*The Representation Theory of the Symmetric Groups*', Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. **682**, Springer, NewYork/Heidelberg/Berlin, 1978.

[J3] G.D. James, On the minimal dimensions of irreducible representations of symmetric groups, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **94** (1983), 417–424.

[JLPW] C. Jansen, K. Lux, R.A. Parker, and R.A. Wilson, '*An ATLAS of Brauer Characters*', Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995.

[KaL] W.M. Kantor and R. Liebler, The rank 3 permutation representations of the finite classical groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **271** (1982), 1–71.

[KlL] P.B. Kleidman and M.W. Liebeck, '*The Subgroup Structure of the Finite Classical Groups*', London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. no. 129, Camb. Univ. Press, 1990.

[KlW] P.B. Kleidman and D.B. Wales, The projective characters of the symmetric groups that remain irreducible on subgroups, *J. Algebra* **138** (1991), 440–478.

[K1] A.S. Kleshchev, On restrictions of irreducible modular representations of semisimple algebraic groups and symmetric groups to some natural subgroups. I, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **69** (1994), 515–540.

[K2] A.S. Kleshchev, Branching rules for modular representations of symmetric groups. II, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **459** (1995), 163–212.

[K3] A.S. Kleshchev, Branching rules for modular representations of symmetric groups. III. Some corollaries and a problem of Mullineux, *J. London Math. Soc.* **54** (1996), 25–38.

[KS1] A.S. Kleshchev and J. Sheth, Representations of the symmetric group are reducible over simply transitive subgroups, *Math. Z.* **235** (2000), 99–109.

[KS2] A.S. Kleshchev and J. Sheth, Representations of the alternating group which are irreducible over subgroups, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **84** (2002), 194–212.

[KT1] A.S. Kleshchev and Pham Huu Tiep, On restrictions of modular spin representations of symmetric and alternating groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **356** (2004), 1971–1999.

[KT2] A.S. Kleshchev and Pham Huu Tiep, Representations of the general linear groups which are irreducible over subgroups, *Amer. J. Math.* **132** (2010), 425–473.

[LPS] M.W. Liebeck, C. Praeger, and J. Saxl, A classification of the maximal subgroups of the finite alternating groups and symmetric groups, *J. Algebra* **111** (1987), 365–383.

[LS] M.W. Liebeck and G. M. Seitz, On finite subgroups of exceptional algebraic groups, *J. reine angew. Math.* **515** (1999), 25–72.

[Ma] E. Maillet, Sur les isomorphes holoédriques et transitifs des groupes symétriques ou alternés, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **1** (1895), 5–34.

[Mo] B. Mortimer, The modular permutation representations of the known doubly transitive groups, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **41**(1980), 1–20.

[MO] J. Müller and J. Orlob, On the structure of the tensor square of the natural module of the symmetric group, *Algebra Colloq.* **18** (2011), 589–610.

[Mu] G. Mullineux, Bijections of p-regular partitions and p-modular irreducibles of the symmetric groups, *J. London Math. Soc.* **20** (1979), 60–66.

[P] A.M. Phillips, On 2-modular representations of the symmetric groups, *J. Algebra*, **290** (2005), 282–294.

[S] J. Saxl, The complex characters of the symmetric groups that remain irreducible in subgroups, *J. Algebra* **111** (1987), 210–219.

[W] D.B. Wales, Some projective representations of S_n, *J. Algebra* **61** (1979), 37–57.

[Wie] H. Wielandt, '*Finite Permutation Groups*', Academic Press, 1964, 114 pp.

[Wil] R.M. Wilson, A diagonal form for the incidence matrices of t-subsets vs. k-subsets, *European J. Combinatorics* **11** (1990), 609–615.

[Z] I. Zisser, Irreducible products of characters in A_n, *Israel J. Math.* **84** (1993), 147–151.

Department of Mathematics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
E-mail address: klesh@uoregon.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611-8105, USA
E-mail address: sin@ufl.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
E-mail address: tiep@math.arizona.edu